

# Florida Department of Education

**2012-2013**  
**Updated 10/26/12**



## School Improvement Plan (SIP)

### PART I: SCHOOL INFORMATION

School Name:	District Name:
--------------	----------------

## 2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

B.C. Graham Elementary	Hillsborough
<b>Principal:</b> Sharron Doyle	<b>Superintendent:</b> MaryEllen Elia
<b>SAC Chair:</b> Laura Allen	<b>Date of School Board Approval:</b> Pending school board approval

### Student Achievement Data:

The following links will open in a separate browser window.

[School Grades Trend Data](#) (Use this data to complete Sections 1-4 of the reading and mathematics goals and Sections 1 and 2 of the writing and science goals.)

[Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test \(FCAT\)/Statewide Assessment Trend Data](#) (Use this data to inform the problem-solving process when writing goals.)

[High School Feedback Report](#)

[K-12 Comprehensive Research Based Reading Plan](#)

### Highly Qualified Administrators

List your school's highly effective administrators and briefly describe their certification(s), number of years at the current school, number of years as an administrator, and their prior performance record with increasing student achievement at each school. Include history of school grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment performance (Percentage data for Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) progress.

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	Number of Years at Current School	Number of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/ Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year)
Principal	Sharron Doyle	*M.ED Leadership Education *B.A. K-6 ESOL Endorsement	3	8	11/12: D 10/11: C, No AYP 09/10: D, 90% AYP 08/09: B, 100%, AYP 07/08: A, 100%, AYP 06/07:A , No AYP

**2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1**

Assistant Principal	Stacie Kagel-Hothem	*M.ED Leadership *M.ED Elementary Education *B.A. K-6 ESOL Endorsement	3	3	11/12: D 10/11: C, No AYP 09/10: D, 90% AYP 08/09: A, 100%, AYP 07/08: A, 100%, AYP 06/07: B, 100%, AYP
---------------------	---------------------	---	---	---	--

**Highly Qualified Instructional Coaches**

List your school’s highly qualified instructional coaches and briefly describe their certification(s), number of years at the current school, number of years as an instructional coach, and their prior performance record with increasing student achievement at each school. Include history of school grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment performance (Percentage data for Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress. Instructional coaches described in this section are only those who are fully released or part-time teachers in reading, mathematics, or science and work only at the school site.

Subject Area	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	Number of Years at Current School	Number of Years as an Instructional Coach	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year)
--------------	------	-----------------------------	-----------------------------------	---	---

**2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1**

Reading	Jennifer Tasso	M. ED Leadership B.A. Primary K-3 ESOL Endorsement	3	10	<p>11/12: D, No AYP  10/11: C, No AYP  09/10: D, 90% AYP  Name: B. C. Graham  School Grade: D  49% 3 or above:  53% making annual learning gains  63% of bottom quartile making annual learning gains:  Subgroups that made AYP: Black  Subgroups that did not make AYP: ESE, ED</p> <p>09/10: F, %, No AYP  Name: Just  School Grade: F  % 3 or above:  % making annual learning gains:  % of bottom quartile making annual learning gains:  Subgroups that made AYP: None  Subgroups that did not make AYP: Black, Hispanic, ED  ELL</p> <p>08/09: C, 85%, No AYP  Name: Clair Mel  School Grade:  % 3 or above: 58%  % making annual learning gains: 62%  % of bottom quartile making annual learning gains: 46%  Subgroups that made AYP: None  Subgroups that did not make AYP: Black, Hispanic, ED  ELL</p> <p>07/08: D, 64%, No AYP  Name: Clair Mel  School Grade: D  % 3 or above: 58%  % making annual learning gains: 63%</p>
---------	----------------	--	---	----	--

**2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1**

					% of bottom quartile making annual learning gains: 62% Subgroups that made AYP: None. Subgroups that did not make AYP: White, Black, Hispanic, ED, ELL
Reading	Erinn Blough	M. ED Curriculum and Instruction B.A 1-6 ESOL Endorsement	First year	First year	11/12: A 10/11: B School: Heritage Elementary
Science	Laura Allen	B.A. Elem Ed 1-6 ESOL Endorsement	1	1	11/12: D, No AYP School: B.C. Graham Elementary  10/11: B School: Chiaramonte Elementary
Writing	Nekeva McCray	B. A. Elem Ed 1-6 ESOL Endorsement	1	1	11/12: D, No AYP School: B.C. Graham Elementary  10/11: C School: Clair Mel Elementary
Math	Caroline Jenkins	M. ED Leadership B.A. Elem Ed 1-6 ESOL Endorsement	First year	First year	11/12: A 10/11: B School: Chiaramonte Elementary

**Highly Qualified Teachers**

Describe the school-based strategies that will be used to recruit and retain high quality, highly qualified teachers to the school.

Description of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date	Not Applicable (If not, please explain why)
1. Teacher Interview Day	District staff	June	

## 2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

2. Salary Differential (Renaissance Schools)	General of Federal Programs	ongoing	
3. District Mentor Program	District Mentors	ongoing	
4. District Peer Program	District Peers	ongoing	
5. School-based teacher recognition system	Principal	ongoing	
6. Opportunities for teacher leadership	Principal	ongoing	
7. Regular time for teacher collaboration	Principal	ongoing	

### Non-Highly Qualified Instructors

Provide the number of instructional staff and paraprofessionals that are teaching out-of-field (not ESOL certified) and not highly qualified.

Number of staff and paraprofessional that are teaching out-of-field/ and who are not highly effective.	Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective
None	

### Staff Demographics

Total Number of Instructional Staff	% of First-Year Teachers	% of Teachers with 1-5 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 6-14 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 15+ Years of Experience	% of Teachers with Advanced Degrees	% Highly Qualified Teachers	% Reading Endorsed Teachers	% National Board Certified Teachers	% ESOL Endorsed Teachers
44	1% (4)	27% (12)	34% (15)	30% (13)	43% (19)	100% (44)	5% (2)	2% (1)	50% (22)

### Teacher Mentoring Program

Please describe the school's teacher mentoring program by including the names of mentors, the name(s) of mentees, rationale for the pairing, and the planned mentoring activities.

## 2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Mentor Name	Mentee Assigned	Rationale for Pairing	Planned Mentoring Activities
Audrey Himes	Amy Stack	2 <sup>nd</sup> year teacher	Bi-weekly planning, modeling, mentoring
Audrey Himes	Tyler Faulkner	1 <sup>st</sup> year teacher	Weekly planning, modeling, mentoring
Audrey Himes	Lauren Koppel	1 <sup>st</sup> year teacher	Weekly planning, modeling, mentoring

### Additional Requirements

#### Coordination and Integration-Title I Schools Only

Please describe how federal, state, and local services and programs will be coordinated and integrated in the school. Include other Title programs, Migrant and Homeless, Supplemental Academic Instruction funds, as well as violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start, adult education, career and technical education, and/or job training, as applicable.

<p><b>Title I, Part A</b> Services are provided to ensure students who need additional remediation are provided support through: after school and summer programs, quality teachers through professional development, content resource teachers, and mentors.</p>
<p><b>Title I, Part C- Migrant</b> The migrant advocate provides services and support to students and parents. The advocate works with teachers and other programs to ensure that the migrant students' needs are being met.</p>
<p><b>Title I, Part D</b> The district receives funds to support the Alternative Education Program which provides transition services from alternative education to school of choice.</p>
<p><b>Title II</b> The district receives funds for staff development to increase student achievement through teacher training. In addition, the funds are utilized in the Salary Differential Program at Renaissance schools.</p>
<p><b>Title III</b> Services are provided through the district for education materials and ELL district support services to improve the education of immigrant and English Language Learners</p>

## 2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

<b>Title X- Homeless</b> The district receives funds to provide resources (social workers and tutoring) for students for students identified as homeless under the McKinney-Vento Act to eliminate barriers for a free and appropriate education.
<b>Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)</b> SAI funds will be coordinated with Title I funds to provide summer school, reading coaches, and extended learning opportunity programs.
<b>Violence Prevention Programs</b> NA
<b>Nutrition Programs</b> NA
<b>Housing Programs</b> N/A
<b>Head Start</b> We utilize information from students in Head Start to transition into Kindergarten.
<b>Adult Education</b> N/A
<b>Career and Technical Education</b> The career and technical support is specific to each school site in which funds can be utilized, in a specific program, within Title I regulations
<b>Job Training</b> Job training support is specific to each school site in which funds can be utilized, in a specific program, within Title I regulations
<b>Other</b> NA

## Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS/Response to Instruction/Intervention (Rtl))

School-Based MTSS/Rtl Team



## 2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Identify the school-based *MTSS* Leadership Team.

### **Elementary**

The leadership team includes:

- Principal
  - Assistant Principal
  - Guidance Counselor
  - School Psychologist /Behavior Specialist
  - Social Worker / Attendance Committee Representative
  - Academic Coaches (Reading, Math, Writing, Science)
  - ESE teacher
  - Speech/Language-
  - Representatives from the PLCs for each grade level, K-5
  - SES Coordinator/AIS-
  - SAC Chair
  - ELP Coordinator
  - ELL Representative
- (Note that not all members attend every meeting, but are invited based on the goals and purpose of the meeting)

## 2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Describe how the school-based *MTSS* Leadership Team functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions). How does it work with other school teams to organize/coordinate *MTSS* efforts?

The purpose of the core Leadership Team is to:

1. Review school-wide assessment data on an ongoing basis in order to identify instructional needs at all grade levels.
2. Support the implementation of high quality instructional practices at the core and intervention/enrichment (Tiers 2/3) levels.
3. Review ongoing progress monitoring data at the core to ensure fidelity of instruction and attainment of SIP goal(s) in curricular, behavioral, and attendance domains.
4. Communicate school-wide data to PLCs and facilitate problem solving within the content/grade level teams.

The Leadership team meets weekly. Specific responsibilities include:

- Oversee the multi-layered model of instructional delivery (Tier 1/Core, Tier 2/Supplemental and Tier 3/Intensive)
- Create, manage and update the school resource map
- Ensure the master schedule incorporates allocated time for intervention support at all grade levels.
- Determine scheduling needs, and assist teacher teams in identifying research-based instructional materials and intervention resources at Tiers 2/3
- Facilitate the implementation of specific programs (e.g., Extended Learning Programs during and after school; Saturday Academies) that provide intervention support to students identified through data sorts/charts conducted by the PLCs.
- Determine the school-wide professional development needs of faculty and staff and arrange trainings aligned with the SIP goals
- Organize and support systematic data collection (e.g., district and state assessments; during-the-grading period school assessments/checks for understanding; in-school surveys)
- Assist and monitor teacher use of SMART goals per unit of instruction. (data will be collected and analyzed by PLCs and reported to the Leadership Team/PSLT)
- Strengthen the Tier 1 (core curriculum) instruction through the:
  - Implementation and support of PLCs
  - Review of teacher/PLC core curriculum assessments/chapters tests/checks for understanding (data will be collected and analyzed by PLCs and reported to the Leadership Team/PSLT)
  - Use of Common Core Assessments by teachers teaching the same grade/subject area/course (data will be collected and analyzed by PLCs and reported to the Leadership Team/PSLT)
  - Implementation of research-based scientifically validated instructional strategies and/or interventions. (as outlined in our SIP)
  - Communication with major stakeholders (e.g., parents, business partners, etc.) regarding student outcomes through data summaries and conferences.
- On a monthly basis, assist in the evaluation of teacher fidelity data and student achievement data collected during the month.
- Support the planning, implementing, and evaluating the outcomes of supplemental and intensive interventions in conjunction with PLCs and Specialty PSLT.
- Work collaboratively with the PLCs in the implementation of the C-CIM (Core Continuous Improvement Model) on core curriculum material.
- Coordinate/collaborate/integrate with other working committees, such as the Literacy Leadership Team (which is charged with developing a plan for embedding/integrating reading and writing strategies across all other content areas).

## 2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Describe the role of the school-based *MTSS* Leadership Team in the development and implementation of the school improvement plan. Describe how the RtI Problem-solving process is used in developing and implementing the SIP?

- The Chair of SAC is a member of the Leadership Team/PSLT.
- The administration, leadership team, teachers and SAC are involved in the School Improvement Plan development and monitoring throughout the school year.
- The School Improvement Plan is the working document that guides the work of the Leadership Team and all teacher teams. The large part of the work of the team is outlined in the Expected Improvements/Problem Solving Process sections (and related professional development plans) for school-wide goals in Reading, Math, Writing, Science, Attendance and Suspension/Behavior.
- Given that one of the main tasks is to monitor student data related to instruction and interventions, the Leadership Team/PLST monitors the effectiveness of instruction and intervention by reviewing student data as well as data related to implementation fidelity (teacher walk-through data).
- The Leadership Team/PSLT communicates with and supports the PLCs in implementing the proposed strategies by distributing Leadership Team members across the PLCs to facilitate planning and implementation. Once strategies are put in place, the Leadership Team members who are part of the PLCs regularly report on their efforts and student outcomes to the larger Leadership Team/PSLT.
- The Leadership Team/PSLT and PLCs both use the problem solving process (Problem Identification, Problem Analysis, Intervention Design and Implementation and Evaluation) to:
  - Use the problem-solving model when analyzing data:
    1. What is the problem? (Problem Identification)
    2. Why is it occurring? (Problem Analysis and Barrier Identification)
    3. What are we going to do about it? (Action Plan Design and Implementation)
    4. Is it working? (Monitor Progress and Evaluate Action Plan Effectiveness)
  - Identify the problem (based on an analysis of the data disaggregated via data sorts) in multiple areas – curriculum content, behavior, and attendance
  - Develop and test hypotheses about why student/school problems are occurring (changeable barriers).
  - Develop and target interventions based on confirmed hypotheses.
  - Identify appropriate progress monitoring assessments to be administered at regular intervals matched to the intensity of the level of instructional/intervention support provided.
  - Develop grading period or units of instruction//intervention goals that are ambitious, time-bound, and measurable (e.g., SMART goals).
  - Review progress monitoring data at regular intervals to determine when student(s) need more or less support (e.g., frequency, duration, intensity) to meet established class, grade, and/or school goals (e.g., use of data-based decision-making to fade, maintain, modify or intensify intervention and/or enrichment support).
  - Each PLC develops PLC action plan for SIP strategy implementation and monitoring.
  - Assess the implementation of the strategies on the SIP using the following questions:
    1. Does the data show implementation of strategies are resulting in positive student growth?
    2. To what extent are we making progress toward the school's SIP goals?
    3. If we are making progress, what can we do to sustain what is working?
    4. What barriers to implementation are we facing and how will we address them?
    5. What should we do next? What should be our plan of action?

### MTSS Implementation

## 2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Describe the data source(s) and the data management system(s) used to summarize data at each tier for reading, mathematics, science, writing, and behavior.

The following table contains a summary of the assessments used to measure student progress in core, supplemental and intensive instruction and their sources and management:

### Core Curriculum (Tier 1)

Data Source	Database	Person (s) Responsible
FCAT released tests	School Generated Excel Database	Reading Coach, Reading Resource Teacher, Math Resource Teacher, Science Resource Teacher, APEI, PSLT
Baseline and Midyear District Assessments	Scantron Achievement Series Data Wall	Leadership Team, PLCs, individual teachers
District generated assessments from the Office of Assessment and Accountability <i>Form A, Form B, Form C</i>	Scantron Achievement Series Data Wall	Leadership Team, PLCs, individual teachers
Subject-specific assessments generated by District-level Subject Supervisors in Reading, Language Arts, Math, Writing and Science <i>Chapter tests in Math and Science, Running Records, DRA2s, Weekly CIMS</i>	Scantron Achievement Series Data Wall PLC Logs	Leadership Team, PLCs, individual teachers
FAIR	Progress Monitoring and Reporting Network Data Wall	Reading Coach/ Reading Resource Teacher/ Reading PLC Facilitator
CELLA	Sagebrush (IPT)	ELL PSLT Representative
Teachers' common core curriculum assessments on units of instruction/big ideas. <i>Leadership Team will monitor all classes monthly by reviewing and participating in PLCs.</i>	Ed-Line PLC Database PLC logs	Individual Teachers/ Team Leaders/ PLC Facilitators/Leadership Team
DRA-2	School Generated Excel Database	Individual Teacher
<i>Reports on Demand/Crystal Reports</i>	<i>District Generated Database</i>	<i>Leadership Team/Specialty PSLT</i>

### Supplemental/Intensive Instruction (Tiers 2 and 3)

Data Source	Database	Person (s) Responsible for Monitoring
-------------	----------	---------------------------------------

## 2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Extended Learning Program (ELP)* ( <i>see below</i> ) Ongoing Progress Monitoring (mini-assessments and other assessments from adopted curriculum resource materials) <b>EASY CMB</b>	School Generated Database in Excel	Leadership Team/ ELP Facilitator
<b><i>Differentiated mini assessments based on core curriculum assessments.</i></b>	<b><i>Individual teacher data base PLC/Department data base</i></b>	<b><i>Individual Teachers/PLCs</i></b>
FAIR OPM	School Generated Database in Excel	Leadership Team/Reading Coach
Ongoing assessments within Intensive Courses ( <i>Middle/High</i> )	Database provided by course materials (for courses that have one), School Generated Database in Excel	Leadership Team/PLC/Individual Teachers
Other Curriculum Based Measurement	<b><i>EasyCBM</i></b> School Generated Database in Excel	Leadership Team/PLCs/ <b><i>Individual Teachers</i></b>
<b><i>Research-based Computer-assisted Instructional Programs such as Success Maker, FCAT Explorer and I-Station</i></b>	<b><i>Assessments included in computer-based programs</i></b>	<b><i>PLCs/Individual Teachers</i></b>

Describe the plan to train staff on **MTSS**.

The Leadership Team will continue to work to build consensus with all stakeholders regarding a need for and a focus on school improvement efforts. The Leadership Team will work to align the efforts of other school teams that may be addressing similar identified issues.

As the District's RtI Committee/RtI Facilitators develop(s) resources and staff development trainings on PS/RtI, these tools and staff development sessions will be conducted with staff when they become available. Professional Development sessions, as identified by teacher needs assessment and/or EET evaluation data, will occur during faculty meeting times or rolling faculty meetings. The Leadership Team will send school team representatives to ongoing PS/RtI trainings/support sessions that are offered district-wide. Our school will invite our area RtI Facilitator to visit quarterly (or as needed) to review our progress in implementation of PS/RtI and provide on-site coaching and support to our Leadership Teams/PLCs. New staff will be directed to participate in trainings relevant to PLCs and PS/RtI as they become available.

Describe plan to support MTSS.

Response to Intervention (RtI) has also been described in Florida as a multi-tiered system of supports (MTSS) for providing high quality instruction and intervention matched to student needs using learning rate over time and level of performance to inform instructional decisions. In order to support MTSS in our schools, we will:

- Consistently promote the shared vision of one system meeting the needs of ALL students with MTSS as the platform for integrating all school initiatives (i.e., PLC, PSLT, Steering, and SAC meetings, lesson study, school-wide behavior management plans).
- Provide designated school personnel with the requisite knowledge and experience to support coordination and implementation of MTSS.
- Provide continued training and support to all school based personnel in problem solving, responding to student data and the use of a systematic method to increase student achievement.

## 2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

### Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team
<p><b>Identify the school-based Literacy Leadership Team (LLT).</b> The Literacy Leadership Team serves as the school's literacy Professional Learning Community. The team is comprised of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>● Principal</li><li>● Assistant Principal for Curriculum</li><li>● Reading Coaches</li><li>● Reading Resource Teacher</li><li>● Reading Teachers</li><li>● Media Specialist</li></ul>
<p><b>Describe how the school-based LLT functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions).</b> The LLT is a subset of the Problem Solving Leadership Team. The team provides leadership for the implementation of the reading goals and strategies identified on the SIP.</p> <p>The principal is the LLT chairperson. The reading coaches and resource teacher are members of the team and provide extensive expertise in data analysis and reading interventions. The reading coaches and principal collaborate with the team to ensure that data driven instructional support is provided to all teachers.</p> <p>The principal also ensures that the LLT monitors reading data, identifies school-wide and individual teachers' reading-focused instructional strengths and weaknesses, and creates a professional development plan to support identified instructional needs in conjunction with the Problem Solving Leadership team's support plan. Additionally the principal ensures that time is provided for the LLT to collaborate and share information with all site stakeholders including other administrators, teachers, staff members, parents and students.</p>
<p><b>What will be the major initiatives of the LLT this year?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>● Implementation and evaluation of the SIP reading goals/strategies across the content areas</li><li>● Professional Development</li><li>● Co-planning, modeling and observation of research-based reading strategies within lessons across the content areas</li><li>● Data analysis (on-going)</li><li>● Implementation of the K-12 Reading Plan</li></ul>

#### *NCLB Public School Choice*

- Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification

#### **\*Elementary Title I Schools Only: Pre-School Transition**

## 2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Describe plans for assisting preschool children in transition from early childhood programs to local elementary school programs as applicable.

In Hillsborough County Public schools, all kindergarten children are assessed for Kindergarten Readiness using the FLKRS (Florida Kindergarten Readiness Screener.) This state-selected assessment contains a subset of the Early Childhood Observation System and the first two measures of the Florida Assessments in Reading (FAIR). The instruments used in the screening are based upon the Florida Voluntary Prekindergarten (VPK) Education Standards. Parents are provided with a letter from the Commissioner of Education, explaining the assessments. Teachers will meet with parents after the assessments have been completed to review student performance. Data from the FAIR will be used to assist teachers in creating homogeneous groupings for small group reading instruction. Children entering Kindergarten may have benefited from the Hillsborough County Public Schools' Voluntary Prekindergarten Program. This program is offered at elementary schools in the summer and during the school year in selected Head Start classrooms and as a blended program in several Early Exceptional Learning Program (EELP) classrooms. Starting in the 2012-2013 school year, students in the VPK program will be given the state-created VPK Assessment that looks at Print Knowledge, Phonological Awareness, Mathematics and Oral Language/Vocabulary. This assessment will be administered at the start and end of the VPK program. A copy of these assessments will be mailed to the school in which the child will be registered for kindergarten, enabling the child's teacher to have a better understanding of the child's abilities from the first day of school. Parent Involvement events for Transitioning Children into Kindergarten include Kindergarten RoundUp. This event provides parents with an opportunity to meet the teachers and hear about the academic program. Parents are encouraged to complete the school registration procedure at this time to ensure that the child is able to start school on time.

**PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS**

**Reading Goals**

<b>Reading Goals</b>	<b>Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</b>						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		



2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

<p><b>1. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring proficient/satisfactory in reading (Level 3-5).</b></p>	<p>1.1. -Teachers knowledge base of this strategy needs professional development. Training for this strategy is being rolled out in 12-13. -Training all content area teachers</p>	<p>1.1. <b>Common Core Reading Strategy Across all Content Areas</b>  <u>Reading</u> comprehension improves when <b>students are engaged in grappling with complex text.</b> Teachers need to understand how to <b>select/identify</b> complex text, <b>shift</b> the amount of informational text used in the content curricula, and <b>share</b> complex texts with all students. <b>All content area teachers are responsible for implementation.</b>   <u>Action Steps</u>                  Action steps for this strategy are outlined on</p>	<p>1.1. <u>Who</u>                  -Principal                  -AP                  -Instructional Coaches                  -Subject Area Leaders                  -PLC facilitators of like grades and/or like courses   <u>How</u>                  -PLC Logs                  -PLCS turn their logs into administration and/or coach after a unit of instruction is complete.                  -Administration and coach rotate through PLCs looking for complex text discussion.                  -Administration shares the positive outcomes observed in PLC meetings on a monthly basis.</p>	<p>1.1. <u>Teacher Level</u>                  -Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction.                  -Teachers use the on-line grading system data to calculate their students' progress towards their PLC and/or individual SMART Goal.  <u>PLC Level</u>                  -Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the SMART goal data across all classes/courses.                  -PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction.                  -For each class/course, PLCs chart their overall progress towards the SMART Goal.  <u>Leadership Team Level</u>                  -PLC facilitator/ Subject Area Leader/ Department Heads shares SMART Goal data with the Leadership Team.                  -Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction.</p>	<p>1.1. <u>3x per year</u>                  - FAIR   <u>During the Grading Period</u>                  - Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit, intervention checks)</p>		
---	--	--	--	---	---	--	--

**2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1**

		grade level/ content area PLC action plans.				
<u>Reading Goal #1:</u> The percentage of students scoring a Level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from <u>28%</u> to <u>36%</u> . (AMO: <u>30%</u> to <u>37%</u> )	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:</u>				
	<b>28%</b> (AMO: <b>30%</b> )	<b>36%</b> (AMO: <b>37%</b> )				

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

		<p>1.2. -Teachers knowledge base of this strategy needs professional development. Training for this strategy is being rolled out in 12-13. -Training all content area teachers</p>	<p>1.2. <b><u>Common Core Reading Strategy Across all Content Areas</u></b> Common Core Questions of all types and levels are necessary to scaffold students' understanding of complex text. Teachers need to understand and use <b><u>higher-order, text-dependent questions</u></b> at the word/phrase, sentence, and paragraph/passage levels (Webb's, Bloom, Costas). Student reading comprehension improves when students are required to provide evidence to support their answers to text-dependent questions. Scaffolding of students' grappling with complex text through well-crafted text-dependent questions assisting students in discovering and achieving deeper understanding of the author's meaning. <b><u>All content area teachers are responsible for implementation.</u></b></p> <p><b><u>Action Steps</u></b> Action steps for this strategy are outlined on grade level/content area PLC action plans.</p>	<p>1.2. <b><u>Who</u></b> -Principal -AP -Instruction Coaches -Resource Teachers -Subject Area Leaders/Department Heads</p> <p><b><u>How</u></b> -Reading PLC Logs -Language Arts PLC Logs -Social Studies PLC Logs -Elective PLC Logs -PLCS turn their logs into administration and/or coach after a unit of instruction is complete. -PLCs receive feedback on their logs. -Reading Coach observations and walk-throughs -Administrative walk-throughs looking for implementation of strategy with fidelity and consistency. -Administrator and Reading Coach aggregate the walk-through data school-wide and shares with staff the progress of strategy implementation.</p>	<p>1.2. <b><u>Teacher Level</u></b> -Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. -Teachers use the on-line grading system data to calculate their students' progress towards the development of their individual/PLC SMART Goal</p> <p><b><u>PLC Level</u></b> -Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the SMART goal data across all classes/courses. -PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction. -For each class/course, PLCs chart their overall progress towards the SMART Goal.</p> <p><b><u>Leadership Team Level</u></b> -PLC facilitator/ Subject Area Leader/ Department Heads shares SMART Goal data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. -Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction.</p>	<p>1.2. <b><u>3x per year</u></b> - FAIR</p> <p><b><u>During the Grading Period</u></b> - Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit, intervention checks)</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

		<p>1.3. -Teachers knowledge base of this strategy needs professional development. Training for this strategy is being rolled out in 12-13. -Training all content area teachers</p>	<p>1.3. <b><u>Common Core Reading Strategy Across all Content Areas</u></b> Teachers need to understand how to <b>design and deliver a close reading</b> lesson. Student reading comprehension improves when students are engaged in close reading instruction using complex text. Specific close reading strategies include: 1) multiple readings of a passage 2) asking higher-order, text-dependent questions, 3) writing in response to reading and 4) engaging in text-based class discussion. <b>All content area teachers are responsible for implementation.</b>  <b><u>Action Steps</u></b> Action steps for this strategy are outlined on grade level/content area PLC action plans.</p>	<p>1.3. <b><u>Who</u></b> -Principal -AP -Instruction Coaches -Subject Area Leaders -PLC facilitators of like grades and/or like courses  <b><u>How</u></b> -Reading Logs -Language Arts Logs -Social Studies Logs -Elective Logs -PLCS turn their logs into administration and/or coach after a unit of instruction is complete. -PLCs receive feedback on their logs. Administration shares the positive outcomes observed in PLC meetings on a monthly basis. -Reading Coach observations and walk-throughs -Administrative walk-throughs looking for implementation of strategy with fidelity and consistency. -Administrator and Reading Coach aggregate the walk-through data school-wide and shares with staff the progress of strategy implementation.</p>	<p>1.3. <b><u>Teacher Level</u></b> -Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. -Teachers maintain their assessments in the on-line grading system. -Teachers use the on-line grading system data to calculate their students' progress towards the development of their individual/PLC SMART Goal. <b><u>PLC Level</u></b> -Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the SMART goal data across all classes/courses. -PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction. - For each class/course, PLCs chart their overall progress towards the SMART Goal. <b><u>Leadership Team Level</u></b> -PLC facilitator/ Subject Area Leader/ Department Heads shares SMART Goal data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. -Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction.</p>	<p>1.3 <b><u>3x per year</u></b> - FAIR  <b><u>During the Grading Period</u></b> - Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit, intervention checks)</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--	---	--

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

	<p>1.4 -Teachers knowled ge base of ERT Structure needs profes sional develo pment. Training for this strategy is being rolled out in 12-13. -Training all content area teachers</p>	<p>1.3. <b><u>ERT (Extended Reading Time- School Wide- 60 minutes a day</u></b> Teachers need to understand how to <b><u>design and deliver ERT</u></b> lessons. Student reading levels will improve when students are engaged in planned reading support lessons daily. <b><u>All content area teachers are responsible for implementation.</u></b>  <b><u>Action Steps</u></b> Action steps for this strategy are outlined</p>	<p>1.3. <b><u>Who</u></b> -Principal -AP -Instruction Coaches -PLC facilitators of like grades and/or like courses  <b><u>How</u></b> -Reading Logs -Language Arts Logs -PLCS turn their logs into administration and/or coach after a unit of instruction is complete. -PLCs receive feedback on their logs. Administration shares the positive outcomes observed in PLC meetings on a monthly basis. -Reading Coach observations and walk-throughs -Administrative walk-throughs looking for implementation of strategy with fidelity and consistency. -Administrator and Reading Coach aggregate the walk-through data school-wide and shares with staff the progress of strategy implementation.</p>	<p>1.3. <b><u>Teacher Level</u></b> -Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. -Teachers maintain their assessments in the on-line grading system.  <b><u>PLC Level</u></b> -Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the SMART goal data across all classes/courses. -PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction. - For each class/course, PLCs chart their overall progress towards the SMART Goal. <b><u>Leadership Team Level</u></b> -PLC facilitator/ Subject Area Leader/ Department Heads shares SMART Goal data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. -Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction.</p>	<p>1.3 <b><u>3x per year</u></b> - FAIR  <b><u>During the Grading Period</u></b> - Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit, intervention checks)</p>		
--	--	--	--	---	---	--	--

**2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1**

		on grade level/ content area PLC action plans and faculty meeting agendas.					
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
<b>2. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring Achievement Levels 4 or 5 in reading.</b>	2.1.	2.1. <b>See Goals 1, 3, &amp; 4</b>	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.		
<u>Reading Goal #2:</u> The percentage of students scoring a Level 4 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 14% to 23%.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:</u>					
	<b>14%</b>	<b>23%</b>					

**2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1**

		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	
		2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

<p><b>3. FCAT 2.0:</b> <b>Points for students making Learning Gains in reading.</b></p>	<p>3.1. PLCs struggle with how to structure curriculum conversations and data analysis to deepen their learning. To address this barrier, this year PLCs are being trained to use the Plan-Do-Check-Act “Instructional Unit” log.</p>	<p>3.1. <b>Strategy</b> Student achievement improves through <b>teachers working collaboratively</b> to focus on student learning. Specifically, they use the <b>Plan-Do-Check-Act</b> model and log to structure their way of work. Using the backwards design model for units of instruction, teachers focus on the following four questions: 1. What is it we expect them to learn? 2. How will we if they have learned it? 3. How will we respond if they don't learn?</p>	<p>3.1. <b>Who</b> -Principal -AP -Instruction Coaches -Subject Area Leaders -PLC facilitators of like grades and/or like courses  <b>How</b> PLCS turn their logs into administration and/or coach after a unit of instruction is complete. -PLCs receive feedback on their logs. -Administrators and coaches attend targeted PLC meetings -Progress of PLCs discussed at Leadership Team -Administration shares the data of PLC visits with staff on a monthly basis.</p>	<p>3.1. School has a system for PLCs to record and report during-the-grading period SMART goal outcomes to administration, coach, SAL, and/or leadership team.</p>	<p>3.1. <u>3x per year</u> FAIR  <u>During the Grading Period</u> Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit)</p>		
---	---	--	---	--	---	--	--



**2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1**

	<p>4. How will we respond if they already know it?</p> <p><u><b>Actions/Details</b></u>          -Grade level/like-course PLCs use a <b>Plan-Do-Check-Act</b> “Unit of Instruction” log to guide their discussion and way of work. Discussions are summarized on log.          -Additional action steps for this strategy are outlined on grade level/content area PLC action plans.</p>					
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

**2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1**

Reading Goal #3:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
Points earned from students making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 62 points to 66 points.							
	<b>62 point s</b>	<b>66 points</b>					

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

		<p>3.2. -Teachers tend to only differentiate after the lesson is taught instead of planning how to differentiate the lesson when new content is presented. -Teachers are at varying levels of using Differentiated Instruction strategies. -Teachers tend to give all students the same lesson, handouts, etc.</p>	<p>3.2. <b><u>Strategy/Task</u></b> Student achievement improves when teachers use on-going student data to <b><u>differentiate instruction</u></b>.  <b><u>Actions/Details</u></b> <b><i>Within PLCs Before Instruction and During Instruction of New Content</i></b> -Using data from previous assessments and daily classroom performance/work, teachers plan Differentiated Instruction groupings and activities for the delivery of new content in upcoming lessons. <b><i>In the classroom</i></b> -During the lessons, <b>students</b> are involved in flexible grouping techniques <b><i>PLCs After Instruction</i></b> -Teachers reflect and discuss the outcome of their DI lessons. -Teachers use student data to identify successful DI techniques for future implementation. -Teachers, using a problem-solving question protocol, identify students who need re-teaching/ interventions and how that instruction</p>	<p>3.2. <b><u>Who</u></b> -Principal -AP -Instruction Coaches -Subject Area Leaders -PLC facilitators of like grades and/or like courses  <b><u>How</u></b> -PLC logs turned into administration, SAL and/or coaches. -PLCS turn their logs into administration and/or coach after a unit of instruction is complete. -PLCs receive feedback on their logs. -Administrators attend targeted PLC meetings -Progress of PLCs discussed at Leadership Team. -Administration shares the positive outcomes observed in PLC meetings on a monthly basis.</p>	<p>3.2. <b><u>Teacher Level</u></b> -Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. -Teachers maintain their assessments in the on-line grading system. -Teachers use the on-line grading system data to calculate their students' progress towards the development of their individual/PLC SMART Goal. <b><u>PLC Level</u></b> -Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the SMART goal data across all classes/ courses. -PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction. - For each class/course, PLCs chart their overall progress towards the SMART Goal. <b><u>Leadership Team Level</u></b> -PLC facilitator/ Subject Area Leader/ Department Heads shares SMART Goal data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. -Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction.</p>	<p>3.2. <b><u>3x per year</u></b> FAIR  <b><u>During the Grading Period</u></b> Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit)</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	---	---	--

**2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1**

			will be provided. <i>(Questions are listed in the 2012-2013 Technical Assistance Document under the Differentiation Cross Content strategy).</i> -Additional action steps for this strategy are outlined on grade level/ content area PLCs.				
		3.3.	3.3.	3.3.	3..3.	3.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

<p><b>4. FCAT 2.0:</b> <b>Points for students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.</b></p>	<p>4.1. -Scheduling time for the principal/ APC to meet with the academic coach on a regular basis. -Teachers willingness to accept support from the coach.</p>	<p>4.1. <u>Strategy</u> <u>Across all Content Areas</u>  <u>Strategy/ Task</u> Student achievement improves through <u>teachers' collaboration with the academic coach</u> in all content areas.  <u>Actions/ Details</u> <i>Academic Coach</i> -The academic coach and administration conducts one-on-one data chats with individual teachers using students' past and/or present data. -The academic coach rotates through all subjects' PLCs to: --Facilitate lesson planning that embeds rigorous tasks</p>	<p>4.1. <u>Who</u> Administration  <u>How-</u> -Review of coach's log -Review of coach's log of support to targeted teachers. -Administrative walk-throughs of coaches working with teachers (either in classrooms, PLCs or planning sessions)</p>	<p>4.1. -Tracking of coach's participation in PLCs. -Tracking of coach's interactions with teachers (planning, co-teaching, modeling, de-briefing, professional development, and walk throughs) -Administrator-Instructional Coach meetings to review log and discuss action plan for coach for the upcoming two weeks</p>	<p>4.1. <u>3x per year</u> - FAIR  <u>During the Grading Period</u> - Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit)</p>		
---	---	---	--	--	---	--	--

**2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1**

	<p>--Facilitate development, writing, selection of higher-order, text-dependent questions/ activities, with an emphasis on Webb's Depth of Knowledge question hierarchy</p> <p>--Facilitate the identification, selection, and development of rigorous core curriculum common assessments</p> <p>--Facilitate core curriculum assessment data analysis</p> <p>--Facilitate the planning for interventions and the intentional grouping of the students.</p> <p>-Using walk-through data, the academic coach and administration identify teachers for support in co-planning,</p>					
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

**2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1**

	<p>modeling, co-teaching, observing and debriefing.          -The academic coach trains each subject area PLC on how to facilitate their own PLC using structured protocols.          -Throughout the school year, the academic coach/administration conducts one-on-one data chats with individual teachers using the data gathered from walk-through tools. This data is used for future professional development, both individually and as a department.</p> <p><b><i>Leadership Team and Coach</i></b>          -The academic coach meets with the</p>					
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

**2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1**

		<p>principal/APC to map out a high-level summary plan of action for the school year.</p> <p>-Every two weeks, the academic coach meets with the principal/APC to:</p> <p>--Review log and work accomplished and</p> <p>--Develop a detailed plan of action for the next two weeks.</p>					
<p><u>Reading Goal #4:</u></p> <p>Points earned from students in the bottom quartile making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 55 points to 60 points.</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p>					
	<p><b>55 point s</b></p>	<p><b>60 points</b></p>					



2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

		<p>4.2 -The Extended Learning Program (ELP) does not always target the specific skill weaknesses of the students or collect data on an ongoing basis. -Not always a direct correlation between what the students is missing in the regular classroom and the instruction received during ELP. -Minimal communication between regular and ELP teachers.</p>	<p>4.2 <u>Strategy</u> Students' reading comprehension improves through receiving <u>ELP supplemental instruction on targeted skills</u> that are not at the mastery level.  <u>Action Steps</u> -Classroom teachers communicate with the ELP teachers regarding specific skills that students have not mastered. -ELP teachers identify lessons for students that target specific skills that are not at the mastery level. -Students attend ELP sessions. -Progress monitoring data collected by the ELP teacher on a weekly or biweekly basis and communicated back to the regular classroom teacher. -When the students have mastered the specific skill, they are exited from the ELP program.</p>	<p>4.2 <u>Who</u> Administrators  <u>How Monitored</u> Administrators will review the communication logs and data collection used between teachers and ELP teachers outlining skills that need remediation.</p>	<p>4.2 Supplemental data shared with leadership and classroom teachers who have students.</p>	<p>4.2 Curriculum Based Measurement (CBM) <i>(From District RtI/Problem Solving Facilitators.)</i></p>	

**2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1**

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier						
Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), Reading and Math Performance Target	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	
<b>5. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.</b>		<b>Information on how to fill out this section/row is forthcoming from the state.</b>					
<b>Reading Goal #5: Data for this goal can be found on The Office of Assessment’s SIP Evaluation and Development Report</b>							

**2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1**

<p><b>5A. Student subgroups by ethnicity</b> (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) <b>not making satisfactory progress in reading.</b></p>	5A.1.	5A.1. <b>See Goals 1, 3, &amp; 4</b>	5A.1.	5A.1.	5A.1.		
<p><b>Reading Goal #5A:</b> The percentage of Black students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Reading will increase from <u>21%</u> to <u>29%</u>.  (AMO: from <u>23%</u> to <u>31%</u>)</p>	<p>2012 Current Level of Performance</p>	<p>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</p>					
	<p>White: NA Black: 21% (AMO: 23%) Hispanic: 46% (AMO: 48%) Asian: NA American Indian: NA</p>	<p>White: NA Black: 29% (AMO: 31%) Hispanic: 52% (AMO: 53%) Asian: NA American Indian: NA</p>					
		5A.2.	5A.2	5A.2	5A.2	5A.2	

**2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1**

	5A.3.	5A.3.	5A.3.	5A.3.	5A.3.	5A.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
<b>5B. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading.</b>	5B.1.	5B.1. <b>See Goals 1, 3, &amp; 4</b>	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.		
<b>Reading Goal #5B:</b> The percentage of Economically Disadvantaged students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/ FAA Reading will increase from <u>28</u> % to <u>36</u> %.  (AMO: from <u>30</u> % to <u>37</u> %)	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance</u>					

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

	<b>28%</b> (AMO: 30%)	<b>36%</b> (AMO: 37%)					
		5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	
		5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	
<b>Editor Note – The ESOL Resource Teacher is referred to as ERT in the strategies below.</b>	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading.		See Goals 1, 3, & 4					

**2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1**

Less than 10 ELL 2011-2012  The percentage of ELL scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/ FAA Reading will increase from <u>24</u> % to <u>32</u> %.  (AMO: <u>31</u> % to <u>38</u> %)	2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:					
	<b>24%</b> (AMO: <b>31%</b> )	<b>32%</b> (AMO: <b>38%</b> )					
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy			

**2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1**

<p><b>5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading.</b></p>	<p>5D.1. -Need to provide a school organization structure and procedure for regular and on-going review of students' IEPs by both the general education and ESE teacher. To address this barrier, the APC will put a system in place for this school year.</p>	<p>5D.1. <u>Strategy</u> SWD student achievement improves through the effective and <u>consistent implementation of students' IEP</u> goals, strategies, modifications, and accommodations. -Throughout the school year, teachers of SWD review students' IEPs to ensure that IEPs are implemented consistently and with fidelity. -Teachers (both individually and in PLCs) work to improve upon both individually and collectively, the ability to effectively implement IEP/SWD</p>	<p>5D.1. <u>Who</u> Principal, Site Administrator, Assistance Principal ESE Specialist <u>How</u> IEP Progress Reports reviewed by APC</p>	<p>5D.1. <u>Teacher Level</u> -Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. -Teachers use the on-line grading system data to calculate their students' progress towards their PLC and/or individual SMART Goal. <u>PLC Level</u> -Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the SMART goal data across all classes/courses. -PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction. -For each class/course, PLCs chart their overall progress towards the SMART Goal. <u>Leadership Team Level</u> -PLC facilitator/ Subject Area Leader/ Department Heads shares SMART Goal data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. -Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction.</p>	<p>5D.1. -FAIR <u>During the Grading Period</u> -Core curriculum end of core common unit/ segment tests with data aggregated for SWD performance</p>		
---	--	--	--	---	--	--	--

**2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1**

		strategies and modifications into lessons.				
Reading Goal #5D: The percentage of SWD scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/ FAA Reading will increase from <u>9</u> % to <u>19</u> %.  (AMO: from <u>19%</u> to <u>27%</u> )	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:</u>				
	<b>9%</b>  (AMO: <b>19%</b> )	<b>19%</b>  (AMO: <b>27%</b> )				



2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

		<p>5D.2. -Improving the proficiency of SWD in our school is of high priority. -Teachers need support in drilling down their core assessments to the SWD level. -General educational teacher and ESE teacher need consistent, on-going co-planning time.</p>	<p>5D.2. <b>Strategy/Task</b> SWD student achievement improves through <b>teachers' implementation of the Plan-Do-Check-Act model</b> in order to plan/carry out lessons/assessments with appropriate strategies and modifications.  <b>Actions Plan</b> For an upcoming unit of instruction determine the following: -What do we want our SWD to learn by the end of the unit? -What are standards that our SWD need to learn? -How will we assess these skills/standards for our SWD? -What does mastery look like? -What is the SMART goal for this unit of instruction for our SWD?  <b>Plan for the "Do"</b> What do teachers need to do in order to meet the SWD SMART goal? -What resources do we need? -How will the lessons be designed to maximize the learning of SWD? -What checks-for-understanding will</p>	<p>5D.2 <b>Who</b> -School based Administrators -PLC Facilitators  <b>How</b> PLC logs (with specific SWD information) for like courses/grades.</p>	<p>5D.2 <b>Teacher Level</b> -Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. -Teachers use the on-line grading system data to calculate their students' progress towards their PLC and/or individual SWD SMART Goal. <b>PLC Level</b> -Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the SWD SMART goal data across all classes/courses. -PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction. -For each class/course, PLCs chart their overall progress towards the SWD SMART Goal. <b>Leadership Team Level</b> -PLC facilitator/ Subject Area Leader/ Department Heads shares SWD SMART Goal data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. -Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction.</p>	<p>5D.2 -FAIR  <b>During the Grading Period</b> -Core curriculum end of core common unit/ segment tests with data aggregated for SWD performance</p>	
--	--	---	---	---	--	--	--

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

		<p>we implement for our SWD?          -What teaching strategies/best practices will we use to help SWD learn?          -Specifically how will we implement the _____ strategy during the lesson?          -What are teachers going to do during the lesson for SWD?          -What are SWD going to do during the lesson to maximize learning?</p> <p><b><i>Reflect on the “Do”/ Analyze Checks for Understanding and Student Work during the unit.</i></b></p> <p>For lessons that have already been taught within the unit of instruction, teachers <b>reflect</b> and discuss one or more of the following regarding their SWD:          -What worked within the lesson? How do we know it was successful? Why was it successful?          -What didn't work within the lesson? Why? What are we going to do next?          -For the implementation of the _____ strategy, what worked? How do we know it was successful? Why was it successful?          What checks for</p>				
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

		<p>understanding were used during the lessons?          -For the implementation of the ____ strategy, what didn't work?          Why? What are we going to do next?          -What were the outcomes of the checks for understanding? And/or analysis of student performance?          -How do we take what we have learned and apply it to future lessons?</p> <p><b>Reflect/Check – Analyze Data</b>          Discuss one or more of the following:          -What is the SWD data?          -What is the data telling us as individual teachers?          -What is the data telling us as a grade level/PLC/department?          -What are SWD not learning? Why is this occurring?          -Which SWD are learning?</p> <p><b>Act on the Data</b>          After data analysis, develop a plan to act on the data.          -What are we going to do about SWD not learning?          -What are the skills/concepts/standards that need re-teaching/</p>				
--	--	---	--	--	--	--

**2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1**

			interventions (either to individual SWD or small groups)? -How are we going to re-teach the skill differently? -How we will know that our re-teaching/interventions are working?				
		5D.3	5D.3	5D.3	5D.3	5D.3	

**Reading Professional Development**

<b>Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity</b> Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Differentiated Instruction	Grades K-5	-Subject Area Leaders -Course specific PLC Facilitators -Reading Coach	All teachers Faculty Professional Development and on-going PLCs	-On-going -Demonstration classrooms	Classroom walk-throughs Optional peer teacher observations	Administration Team Instructional Coaches Subject Area Leaders
The 3 S's of Complex Text: Selecting /Identifying Complex Text, Shifting to Increased Use of Informational Text, and Sharing of Complex Text with All Students (K-12)	Grades K-5	Reading Coach and Subject Area Leaders	All teachers Faculty Professional Development and on-going PLCs	On-going	Classroom walkthroughs	Administration Team Instructional Coaches Subject Area Leaders

**2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1**

Identifying and Creating Text-Dependent Questions to Deepen Reading Comprehension (K-12)	Grades K-5	Reading Coach and Subject Area Leaders	All teachers Faculty Professional Development and on-going PLCs	On-going	Classroom walkthroughs	Administration Team Instructional Coaches Subject Area Leaders
Designing and Delivering a Close Reading Lesson Using in-Depth Questioning (K-12)	Grades K-5	Reading Coach and Subject Area Leaders	All teachers Faculty Professional Development and on-going PLCs	On-going	Classroom walkthroughs	Administration Team Instructional Coaches Subject Area Leaders
IEP Training	Grades K-5	ESE Teachers	ESE Teachers General Ed Teachers PLCs	On-going	Case Manager	ESE Specialist
SWD Co-Teaching	Grades K-5	DRT	ESE Teachers General Ed Teachers PLCs	On-going	Classroom walkthroughs	Administration Team DRT
ELL Strategies	Grades K-5	English Language Learner Resource Teacher (ERT)	All teachers Faculty Professional Development and on-going PLCs	On-going	Classroom walkthroughs	Administration Team

*End of Reading Goals*

**PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS**

**Elementary Mathematics Goals**

Elementary School Mathematics Goals	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

<p><b>1. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring proficient/satisfactory performance in mathematics (Level 3-5).</b></p>	<p>1.1 -Lack of infrastructure to support technology -Lack of technology hardware -Teachers at varying understanding of the intent of the CCSS</p>	<p>1.1 <b>Strategy</b> Students' math achievements improve through the use of <b>technology and hands-on activities</b> to implement the Common Core State Standards (GO Math). In addition, student practice taking on-line assessments to prepare students for on-line state testing. <b>Action Steps</b> -PLCs use their core curriculum information to learn more about hands-on and technology activities. -Additional action steps for this strategy are outlined on grade level/content area PLC action plans.</p>	<p>1.1 <b>Who</b> - Principal -Math Academic Coach(District) -Math Resource Teacher  <b>How Monitored</b> -PLCS turn their logs into administration after a unit of instruction is complete. -PLCs receive feedback on their logs. -Classroom walk-throughs observing this strategy. -Administrator and resource teacher aggregates the walk-through data school-wide and shares with staff the progress of strategy implementation</p>	<p>1.1 PLCs will review unit assessments and chart the increase in the number of students reaching at least 70% mastery on units of instruction.  PLC facilitator will share data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. The Problem Solving Leadership Team will review assessment data for positive trends.</p>	<p>1.1 <u>2x per year</u> District Baseline and Mid-Year Testing  <u>During the Grading Period</u> -Core Curriculum Assessments (pre, mid, end of unit, chapter, etc.) -Benchmark mini- assessments</p>		
---	--	---	---	--	---	--	--

**2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1**

		-Monthly Math Technology Trainings offered				
<b>Mathematics Goal #1:</b> The percentage of students scoring a Level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from 36% to 42%.  (AMO: from 38% to 44%)	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance</u>				
	<b>36%</b>  (AMO: 38%)	<b>42%</b>  (AMO: 44%)				



**2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1**

		<p>1.2. -Teachers are at varying skill levels with higher order questioning techniques. -PLC meetings need to focus on identifying and writing higher order questions to deliver during the lessons. -Finding time to conduct Webb's Depth of Knowledge walk-throughs is sometimes challenging.</p>	<p><b>1.2</b> <b>Strategy/Task</b> Students math achievement improves through frequent participation in <u>higher order questions/discussion activities</u> to deepen and extend student knowledge. These quality questions/prompts and discussion techniques promotes thinking by students, assisting them to arrive at new understandings of complex material. <b>Actions/Details</b> <b>Within PLCs</b> -Teachers work to improve upon both individually and collectively, the ability to effectively use higher order questions/activities. -Teachers plan higher order questions/activities for upcoming lessons to increase the lessons' rigor and promote student achievement. -Teachers plan for scaffolding questions and activities to meet the differentiated needs of students. -After the lessons, teachers examine student work samples and classroom questions using Webb's Depth of Knowledge to evaluate the sophistication/complexity of students' thinking. -Use student data to identify successful higher order</p>	<p><b>Who</b> -Principal -Math Academic Coach(District) -Math Resource Teacher <b>How Monitored</b> -PLCS turn their logs into administration after a unit of instruction is complete. -PLCs receive feedback on their Logs. -Classroom walk-throughs using Webb's Depth of Knowledge wheel as a higher order walk-through form. They look for implementation of strategy with fidelity and consistency -Administrator and coach aggregates the walk-through data school-wide and shares with staff the progress of strategy implementation</p>	<p>1.1 PLCs will review unit assessments and chart the increase in the number of students reaching at least 70% mastery on units of instruction.  PLC facilitator will share data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. The Problem Solving Leadership Team will review assessment data for positive trends.</p>	<p>1.1 <u>2x per year</u> District Baseline and Mid-Year Testing  <u>During the Grading Period</u> -Core Curriculum Assessments (pre, mid, end of unit, chapter, interventions etc.)  -Benchmark mini- assessments</p>	
--	--	---	--	---	--	--	--

**2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1**

		<p>questioning techniques for future implementation.          -Hot Talk, cool moves training          -Powerful Planning Training</p> <p><b><i>In the classroom</i></b>  <u>During the lessons.</u>  <b><u>teachers:</u></b>          -Ask questions and/or provides activities that require students to engage in frequent higher order thinking as defined by Webb’s Depth of Knowledge.          -Wait for full attention from the class before asking questions.          -Provide students with wait time.          -Use probing questions to encourage students to elaborate and support assertions and claims drawn from the text/content.          -Allow students to “unpack their thinking” by describing how they arrive at an answer.          -Encourage discussion by using open-ended questions.          -Ask questions with multiple correct answers or multiple approaches.          -Scaffold questions to help students with incorrect answers.          -Engage all students in the discussion and ensure that all voices are heard.</p> <p><u>During the lessons, students:</u></p>				
--	--	---	--	--	--	--

**2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1**

			<p>-Have opportunities to formulate many of the high-level questions based on the text/content.</p> <p>-Have time to reflect on classroom discussion to increase their understanding (and without teacher mediation).</p> <p><u>School Leadership</u></p> <p>-The coach/resource teacher/PLC member/administrator collects higher order questioning walk-through data using Webb’s Depth of Knowledge wheel.</p> <p>-Monthly, school leaders conduct one-on-one data chats with individual teachers using the data gathered from walk-through tools. This teacher data/chats guides the leadership’s team professional development plan (both individually and whole faculty).</p>				
		1.3.	1.3.				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring				

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

<p><b>2. FCAT 2.0:</b> Students scoring Achievement Levels 4 or 5 in mathematics.</p>	<p>2.1. <b>See 1.1</b></p>	<p>2.1. <b>See 1.1</b></p>	<p>2.1. <b>See 1.1</b></p>	<p>2.1. <b>See 1.1</b></p>	<p>2.1. <b>See 1.1</b></p>		
<p>Mathematics Goal #2:  The percentage of students scoring a Level 4 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from 15% to 24%.</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:</u></p>					
	<p><b>15%</b></p>	<p><b>24%</b></p>					
		<p>2.2.</p>	<p>2.2.</p>	<p>2.2.</p>	<p>2.2.</p>	<p>2.2.</p>	
		<p>2.3</p>	<p>2.3</p>	<p>2.3</p>	<p>2.3</p>	<p>2.3</p>	

**2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1**

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
--	---------------------	----------	---	---	-----------------	--	--

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

<p><b>3. FCAT 2.0: Points for students making learning gains in mathematics.</b></p>	<p>3.1. -PLCs struggle with how to structure curriculum and data analysis discussion to deepen their leaning. To address this barrier, this year PLCs are being trained to use the Plan-Do-Check-Act “Instructional Unit” log.</p>	<p>3.1. <u>Strategy</u> Students’ math achievement improves through <u>teachers working collaboratively</u> to focus on student learning. Specifically, they use the <u>Plan-Do-Check-Act model</u> and log to structure their way of work. Using the backwards design model for units of instruction, teachers focus on the following four questions: 1. What is it we expect them to learn? 2. How will we know if they have learned it? 3. How</p>	<p>3.1. <u>Who</u> -Principal -AP -Instruction Coaches -Subject Area Leaders -PLC facilitators  <u>How</u> PLCS turn their logs into administration after a unit of instruction is complete. -PLCs receive feedback on their logs. -Administrators and coaches attend targeted PLC meetings -Progress of PLCs discussed at Leadership Team -Administration shares the data of PLC visits with staff on a monthly basis.</p>	<p>3.1. School has a system for PLCs to record and report during-the-grading period SMART goal outcomes to administration, coach, SAL, and/or leadership team.</p>	<p>3.1. <u>2x per year</u> District Baseline and Mid-Year Testing  <u>During the Grading Period</u> Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit)  -Benchmark mini- assessments</p>		
--	--	---	---	--	---	--	--

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

		<p>will we respond if they don't learn?</p> <p>4. How will we respond if they already know it?</p> <p><b><u>Actions/Details</u></b></p> <p>-This year, the like-course PLCs will administer common end-of-chapter assessments. The assessments will be identified/generated prior to the teaching of the unit.</p> <p>-Grade level/like-course PLCs use a <b>Plan-Do-Check-Act "Unit of Instruction"</b> log to guide their discussion and way of work. Discussions are</p>					
--	--	---	--	--	--	--	--

**2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1**

		summarized on log. -Additional action steps for this strategy are outlined on grade level/ content area PLC action plans.					
Mathematics Goal #3:  Points earned from students making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from 69 points to 73 points.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<b>69</b>	<b>73</b>					



2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

		<p>3.2. -Teachers tend to only differentiate after the lesson is taught instead of planning how to differentiate the lesson when new content is presented. -Teachers are at varying levels of using Differentiated Instruction strategies. -Teachers tend to give all students the same lesson, handouts, etc. - Arrangements will be made with administration to attend after schools math trainings due to late release of being an Extended Reading Time School</p> <p>3.2. <b><u>Strategy/Task</u></b> Students' math achievement improves when teachers use on-going student data to <b>differentiate instruction.</b></p> <p><b><u>Actions/Details</u></b> <b><i>Within PLCs Before Instruction and During Instruction of New Content</i></b> -Using data from previous assessments and daily classroom performance/work, teachers plan Differentiated Instruction groupings and activities for the delivery of new content in upcoming lessons. <b><i>In the classroom</i></b> -During the lessons, <b>students</b> are involved in flexible grouping techniques <b><i>PLCs After Instruction</i></b> -Teachers reflect and discuss the outcome of their DI lessons. -Use student data to identify successful DI techniques for future implementation. -Using a problem-solving question protocol, identify students who need re-teaching/interventions and how that instruction will be provided. (<i>Questions are listed in the 2012-2013 Technical Assistance Document under the Differentiation Cross Content strategy</i>). -Additional action steps for this strategy are outlined on grade level/content area</p>	<p>3.2. <b><u>Who</u></b> -Principal -AP -Instruction Coaches -Subject Area Leaders -PLC facilitators of like grades and/or like courses</p> <p><b><u>How</u></b></p>	<p>3.2. <b><u>Teacher Level</u></b> -Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. -Teachers maintain their assessments in the on-line grading system. -Teachers use the on-line grading system data to calculate their students' progress towards the development of their individual/PLC SMART Goal. <b><u>PLC Level</u></b> -Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the SMART goal data across all classes/courses. -PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction. - For each class/course, PLCs chart their overall progress towards the SMART Goal. <b><u>Leadership Team Level</u></b> -PLC facilitator/ Subject Area Leader/ Department Heads shares SMART Goal data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. -Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction.</p>	<p>3.2. <b><u>2x per year</u></b> District Baseline and Mid-Year Testing</p> <p><b><u>During the Grading Period</u></b> Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit)</p> <p>-Benchmark mini- assessments</p>	
--	--	--	---	--	---	--

**2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1**

			PLCs. <i>-Attend Powerful Planning Math Training and Have Resource Teacher bring components into grade Level PLCs</i>				
		3.3.	3.3.	3.3.	3.3.	3.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

<p><b>4. FCAT 2.0: Points for students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.</b></p>	<p>4.1. -Scheduling time for the principal/APC to meet with the academic coach on a regular basis. -Teachers willingness to accept support from the coach.</p>	<p>4.1. <u>Strategy</u> <u>Across all Content Areas</u> <u>Strategy/Task</u> Students' math achievement improves through <u>teachers' collaboration with the academic coach</u> in all content areas.  <u>Actions/Details</u> <i>Academic Coach</i> -The academic coach and administration conducts one-on-one data chats with individual teachers using the teacher's student past and/or present data. -The academic coach rotates through all subjects'</p>	<p>4.1. <u>Who</u> Administration  <u>How</u> -Review of coach's log -Review of coach's log of support to targeted teachers. -Administrative walk-throughs of coaches working with teachers (either in classrooms, PLCs or planning sessions)</p>	<p>4.1. -Tracking of coach's participation in PLCs. -Tracking of coach's interactions with teachers (planning, co-teaching, modeling, de-briefing, professional development, and walk throughs. -Administrator-Instructional Coach meetings to review log and discuss action plan for coach for the upcoming two weeks.</p>	<p>4.1. <u>2x per year</u> District Baseline and Mid-Year Testing  Semester Exams  <u>During the Grading Period</u> - Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit)</p>		
--	--	--	---	---	---	--	--

**2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1**

	<p>PLCs to:          --Facilitate lesson planning that embeds rigorous tasks          --Facilitate development, writing, selection of higher-order , text-dependent questions/ activities, with an emphasis on Webb’s Depth of Knowledge question hierarchy          --Facilitate the identification, selection, development of rigorous core curriculum common assessments,          --Facilitate core curriculum assessment data analysis          --Facilitate the planning for interventions and the intentional grouping of</p>					
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

**2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1**

	<p>the students          -Using walk-through data, the academic coach and administration identify teachers for support in co-planning, modeling, co-teaching, observing and debriefing.          -The academic coach trains each subject area PLC on how to facilitate their own PLC using structured protocols.          -Throughout the school year, the academic coach/administration conducts one-on-one data chats with individual teachers using the data gathered from walk-through tools. This data is used</p>					
--	---	--	--	--	--	--

**2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1**

		<p>for future professional development, both individually and as a department.</p> <p><b><i>Leadership Team and Coach</i></b></p> <p>-The academic coach meets with the principal/APC to map out a high-level summary plan of action for the school year.</p> <p>-Every two weeks, the academic coach meets with the principal/APC to:</p> <p>--Review log and work accomplished and</p> <p>--Develop a detailed plan of action for the next two weeks.</p>					
--	--	---	--	--	--	--	--

**2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1**

<u>Mathematics Goal #4:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:</u>					
Points earned from students in the bottom quartile making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from 68 to 72.							
	<b>68</b>	<b>72</b>					

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

		<p>4.2 -The During the Day Extended Learning Program (ELP) does not always target the specific skill weaknesses of the students or collect data on an ongoing basis. -Not always a direct correlation between what the students is missing in the regular classroom and the instruction received during ELP. -Minimal communication between regular and ELP teachers.</p>	<p>4.2 <u>Strategy</u> Students' math achievement improves through receiving <u>ELP supplemental instruction on targeted skills</u> that are not at the mastery level. <u>Action Steps</u> -Classroom teachers communicate with the ELP teachers regarding specific skills that students have not mastered. -ELP teachers identify lessons for students that target specific skills that are not at the mastery level. - Students attend ELP sessions. - Progress monitoring data collected by the ELP teacher on a weekly or biweekly basis and communicated back to the regular classroom teacher. -When the students have mastered the specific skill, they are exited from the ELP program.</p>	<p>4.2 <u>Who</u> Administrators  <u>How Monitored</u> Administrators will review the communication logs and data collection used between teachers and ELP teachers outlining skills that need remediation.</p>	<p>4.2 Supplemental data shared with leadership and classroom teachers who have students.</p>	<p>4.2 Curriculum Based Measurement (CBM) <i>(From District RtI/Problem Solving Facilitators.)</i></p>	
		4.3	4.3.	4.3.	4.3.	4.3.	



**2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1**

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), Reading and Math Performance Target	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	
<b>5. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.</b>		<b>Information on how to fill out this row is forthcoming from the state.</b>					
Math Goal #5:							

**2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1**

<p><b>5A. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics</b></p>	<p>5A.1.</p>	<p>5A.1. <b>See goals 1, 3 &amp; 4</b></p>	<p>5A.1.</p>	<p>5A.1.</p>	<p>5A.1.</p>		
<p><b>Mathematics Goal #5A:</b>  The percentage of Black students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Math will increase from <u>30</u> % to <u>37</u> %.  (AMO: from <u>32%</u> to <u>39%</u>)</p>	<p>2012 Current Level of Performance:</p>	<p>2013 Expected Level of Performance:</p>					
	<p>White: NA Black: 30% (AMO: 32%) Hispanic: 49% (AMO: 55%) Asian: NA American Indian: NA</p>	<p>White: NA Black: 37% (AMO: 39%) Hispanic: 55% (AMO: 60%) Asian: NA American Indian: NA</p>					

**2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1**

		5A.2.	5A.2.	5A.2.	5A.2.	5A.2.	
		5A.3.	5A.3.	5A.3.	5A.3.	5A.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
<b>5B. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.</b>	5B.1.	5B.1. <b>See 1.1</b>	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.		
Mathematics Goal #5B:  The percentage of Economically Disadvantaged students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Math will increase from <u>36</u> % to <u>43</u> %.  <b>(AMO: from 39% to 44%)</b>	2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:					

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

	<b>36%</b> <b>(AMO: 39%)</b>	<b>43%</b> <b>(AMO: 44%)</b>					
		5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.	
		5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	
<b>Editor Note – The ESOL Resource Teacher is referred to as ERT in the strategies below.</b>	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.		<b>See 1.1</b>					

**2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1**

Mathematics Goal	2012 Current	2013 Expected					
#5C:	Level of	Level of					
The percentage	Performance:	Performance:					
of ELL students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Math will increase from <u>24</u> % to <u>32</u> %.  (AMO: from <u>44</u> % to <u>50</u> %)							
	<b>24%</b>  (AMO: 44%)	<b>32%</b>  (AMO: 50%)					
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

<p><b>5D. Student with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.</b></p>	<p>5D.1. -Need to provide a school organization structure and procedure for regular and on-going review of students' IEPs by both the general education and ESE teacher. To address this barrier, the APC will put a system in place for this school year.</p>	<p>5D.1. <u>Strategy</u> SWD student achievement improves through the <u>effective and consistent implementation of students' IEP goals</u>, strategies, modifications, and accommodations. -Throughout the school year, teachers of SWD review students' IEPs to ensure that IEPs are implemented consistently and with fidelity. -Teachers (both individually and in PLCs) work to improve upon both individually and collectively, the ability to effectively implement IEP/SWD</p>	<p>5D.1. <u>Who</u> Principal, Site Administrator, Assistance Principal <u>How</u> IEP Progress Reports reviewed by APC</p>	<p>5D.1. <u>Teacher Level</u> -Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. -Teachers use the on-line grading system data to calculate their students' progress towards their PLC and/or individual SWD SMART Goal. <u>PLC Level</u> -Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the SWD SMART goal data across all classes/courses. -PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction. -For each class/course, PLCs chart their overall progress towards the SWD SMART Goal. <u>Leadership Team Level</u> -PLC facilitator/ Subject Area Leader/ Department Heads shares SMART Goal data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. -Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction.</p>	<p>5D.1 <u>2x per year</u> District Baseline and Mid-Year Testing <u>Semester Exams</u> <u>During the Grading Period</u> Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit)</p>		
--	--	--	---	---	--	--	--

**2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1**

		strategies and modifications into lessons.					
<u>Mathematics Goal #5D:</u> The percentage of SWD scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Math will increase from <u>19</u> % to <u>28</u> %.  (AMO: from <u>28%</u> to <u>33%</u> )	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:</u>					
	<b>19%</b> (AMO: <b>28%</b> )	<b>28%</b> (AMO: <b>33%</b> )					

**2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1**

		<p>5D.2. -Improving the proficiency of SWD in our school is of high priority. -Teachers need support in drilling down their core assessments to the SWD level. -General educational teacher and ESE teacher need consistent, on-going co-planning time.</p>	<p>5D.2. <b>Strategy/Task</b> SWD student achievement improves through teachers' implementation of the <b>Plan-Do-Check-Act model</b> in order to plan/carry out lessons/assessments with appropriate strategies and modifications.  <b>Actions</b> <b>Plan</b> For an upcoming unit of instruction determine the following: -What do we want our SWD to learn by the end of the unit? -What are standards that our SWD need to learn? -How will we assess these skills/standards for our SWD? -What does mastery look like? -What is the SMART goal for this unit of instruction for our SWD?  <b>Plan for the "Do"</b> What do teachers need to do in order to meet the SWD SMART goal? -What resources do we need? -How will the lessons be designed to maximize the learning of SWD? -What checks-for-understanding will we implement for our SWD? -What teaching strategies/best practices will we use to</p>	<p>5D.2. <b>Who</b> -Principal -AP -Instruction Coaches -Subject Area Leaders -PLC facilitators of like grades and/or like courses  <b>How</b> -PLC logs turned into administration/coaches. Administration/coaches provides feedback -Administrators attended targeted PLC meetings -Progress of PLCs discussed at Leadership Team</p>	<p>5D.2. School has a system for PLCs to record and report during-the-grading period SWD SMART goal outcomes to administration, coach, SAL, and/or leadership team.</p>	<p>5D.2. School has a system for PLCs to record and report during-the-grading period of SWD SMART goal outcomes to administration, coach, SAL, and/or leadership team.</p>	
--	--	---	--	---	---	--	--



2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

		<p>help SWD learn?          -Specifically how will we implement the _____ strategy during the lesson?          -What are teachers going to do during the lesson for SWD?          -What are SWD student going to do during the lesson to maximize learning?</p> <p><b><i>Reflect on the "Do"/          Analyze Checks for Understanding and Student Work <u>during</u> the unit.</i></b>          For lessons that have already been taught within the unit of instruction, teachers <b>reflect</b> and discuss one or more of the following regarding their SWD:          -What worked within the lesson? How do we know it was successful? Why was it successful?          -What didn't work within the lesson? Why? What are we going to do next?          -For the implementation of the _____ strategy, what worked? How do we know it was successful? Why was it successful? What checks for understanding were used during the lessons?          -For the implementation of the _____ strategy, what didn't work? Why? What are we going to do next?          -What were the outcomes of the checks for</p>				
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

**2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1**

			<p>understanding? And/or analysis of student performance?</p> <p>-How do we take what we have learned and apply it to future lessons?</p> <p><b>Reflect/Check – Analyze Data</b></p> <p>Discuss one or more of the following:</p> <p>-What is the SWD data?</p> <p>-What is the data telling us as individual teachers?</p> <p>-What is the data telling us as a grade level/PLC/department?</p> <p>-What are SWD not learning? Why is this occurring?</p> <p>-Which SWD are learning?</p> <p><b>Act on the Data</b></p> <p>After data analysis, develop a plan to act on the data.</p> <p>-What are we going to do about SWD not learning?</p> <p>-What are the skills/concepts/standards that need re-teaching/interventions (either to individual SWD or small groups)?</p> <p>-How are we going to re-teach the skill differently?</p> <p>-How we will know that our re-teaching/interventions are working?</p>				
		5D.3	5D.3				

**Mathematics Professional Development**

Hillsborough 2012  
 Rule 6A-1.099811  
 Revised July 18, 2012

**2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1**

<b>Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity</b> Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Instructional Materials and Technology for NGSSS	Grades K-5	Math Resource Teachers	Math Teachers	-Professional Study Day -On going Professional Development through weekly PLC's	Administrators conduct targeted walk-throughs	Administration Team
Coaching/Lesson Studies	Grades K-5	Math Resource Teachers	Math Teachers - PLCs	Math Resource Schedules	Coaching logs	Math Resource Teachers
SWD Co-Teaching	Grades K-5	DRT	ESE Teachers General Ed Teachers PLCs	On-going	Classroom walkthroughs	Administration Team DRT
ELL Strategies	Grades K-5	English Language Learner Resource Teacher (ERT)	All teachers Faculty Professional Development and on-going PLCs	On-going	Classroom walkthroughs	Administration Team

*End of Mathematics Goals*

**PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS**

**Science Goals**

<b>Science Goals</b>	<b>Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</b>						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

<p><b>1. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring proficient/satisfactory performance (Level 3-5) in science.</b></p>	<p>1.1 -Teachers are at varying skill levels in the use of inquiry and the 5E lesson plan model.</p>	<p>1.1 <b>Strategy</b> Students' science skills will improve through participation in the <b>5E Instructional Model</b>.</p> <p><b>Action Steps</b> -Teachers will attend a training during a faculty meeting on the 5 E Instructional Model. -PLCs write SMART goals based for units of instruction. -As a Professional Development activity in their PLCs, teachers spend time collaboratively building 5E Instructional Model for upcoming lessons. -PLC teachers instruct students</p>	<p>1.1 <b>Who</b> Principal APEI Science Resource Teacher</p> <p><b>How Monitored</b> -Classroom walk-throughs observing the 5 E's strategy.</p>	<p>1.1 <b>Teacher Level</b> -Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. -Teachers use the on-line grading system data to calculate their students' progress towards their PLC and/or individual SMART Goal.</p> <p><b>PLC Level</b> -Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the SMART goal data across all classes. -PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction. -For each class, PLCs chart their overall progress towards the SMART Goal.</p> <p><b>Leadership Team Level</b> -PLC facilitator/ Science Resource Teacher shares SMART Goal data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. -Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction.</p>	<p>1.1 <b>2x per year</b> District-level baseline and mid-year tests</p> <p><b>3x per year</b> District-level end of nine weeks test</p> <p><b>During the Grading Period</b> -Core Curriculum Assessments (chapter, end of unit, mini-assessments, etc.)</p>		
---	--	--	--	---	--	--	--

**2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1**

		<p>using the 5E Instructional Model.</p> <p>-At the end of the unit, teachers give a common assessment identified from the core curriculum material.</p> <p>-Teachers bring assessment data back to the PLCs.</p> <p>-Based on the data, teachers discuss effectiveness of the 5E Lesson Plans to drive future instruction.</p>				
<p><u>Science Goal #1:</u></p> <p>The percentage of students scoring a Level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Science will increase from 27% to 35%.</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:</u></p>				
	<b>27%</b>	<b>35%</b>				

**2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1**

		<p>1.2. -PLCs struggle with how to structure curriculum conversations and data analysis to deepen their learning. To address this barrier, this year PLCs are being trained to use the Plan-Do-Check-Act “Instructional Unit” log.</p>	<p>1.2. <u>Strategy</u> Student achievement improves through teachers working collaboratively to focus on student learning using the 5E Instructional Model. Specifically, they use the <u>Plan-Do-Check-Act model</u> to structure their way of work. Using the backwards design model for unit of instruction, teachers focus on the following four questions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. What is it we expect them to learn?</li> <li>2. How will we know if they have learned it?</li> <li>3. How will we respond if they don't learn?</li> <li>4. How will we respond if they already know it?</li> </ol> <p><u>Actions/Details</u> <i>Within PLCs:</i> -PLCs will use a PLC log to monitor the following: --Guide their Plan-Do-Check-Act conversations and way of work. --Monitor the</p>	<p>1.2 <u>Who</u> -Principal -APEI -Science Resource Teacher -Subject Area Leaders -PLC facilitators</p> <p><u>How</u> -PLC logs turned into administration/coaches provides feedback -Administrators attended targeted PLC meetings -Progress of PLCs discussed at Leadership Team -Administration shares the data of PLC visits with staff on a monthly basis.</p>	<p>1.2. School has a system for PLCs to record and report during-the-grading period SMART goal outcomes to administration, coach, and/or leadership team.</p>	<p>1.2. <u>2x per year</u> District Baseline and Mid-Year Testing  <u>3x per year</u> District-level end of nine weeks test  <u>During the Grading Period</u> -Core Curriculum Assessments (chapter, end of unit, mini-assessments, etc.)</p>	
--	--	--	---	--	---	---	--

**2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1**

		<p>frequency of meetings. All grade level/subject area PLCs collaborate _____ times per month for curriculum planning, reflection, and data analysis.)                      -Working with the core curriculum, within grade level PLCs teachers will:                      --Unpack the benchmark and identify what students need to understand, know, and do.                      --Plan for checks for understanding during the unit.                      --Plan for the End-of-Unit Assessment                      --Plan upcoming lessons/units using the 5E Instructional Model.                      --Reflect on the outcome of lessons taught                      --Analyze checks for understanding and core curriculum assessments.                      --Act on the core curriculum data by planning interventions for the whole class or small group.                      -PLCs will generate SMART goals for upcoming units of instruction.                      -PLCs will report</p>				
--	--	---	--	--	--	--



**2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1**

			<p>SMART goal data through their logs.          As a Science Department          -PLC, share action plan successes and challenges of the grade levels courses.          -PLCs will adjust action plans based on teacher/coach walk-through data, PLC collaboration, and student data.</p>				
--	--	--	---	--	--	--	--

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

		<p>1.3 -Teachers are at varying skill levels in using appropriate instructional, scientific and laboratory technology (National Geographic on-line, probeware, etc) - Administrators are at varying skill levels in using appropriate instructional, scientific and laboratory technology (National Geographic on-line, probeware, etc )</p>	<p>1.3 <b>Strategy</b> Student understanding of the nature of science and scientific inquiry improves when students are intellectually active in learning important and challenging science content through the use of appropriate instructional methods, <u>scientific processes, laboratory experiences, and uses of technology</u> (animations, probeware, digital microscopy). <b>Action Steps</b> -As a Professional Development activity in their PLCs, teachers spend time sharing, researching, teaching, and modeling technology and hands-on strategies. -Within PLCs, teachers plan for engaging exploration of science content using hands-on learning experiences, inquiry, labs, technology (such as probeware, simulations and animations) within the 5E Instructional</p>	<p>1.3 <b>Who</b> Principal APC Science Resource Teachers  <b>How Monitored</b> -Classroom walk-throughs observing this strategy.</p>	<p>1.3 <b>Teacher Level</b> -Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. -Teachers use the on-line grading system data to calculate their students' progress towards their PLC and/or individual SMART Goal. <b>PLC Level</b> -Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the SMART goal data across all classes. -PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction. - For each class, PLCs chart their overall progress towards the SMART Goal. <b>Leadership Team Level</b> -PLC facilitator/ Subject Area Leader shares SMART Goal data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. -Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction.</p>	<p>1.3 <b>2x per year</b> District-level baseline and mid-year tests  <b>3x per year</b> District-level end of nine weeks test  <b>During the Grading Period</b> -Core Curriculum Assessments (chapter, end of unit, mini-assessments, etc.)</p>	
--	--	--	---	---	---	--	--

**2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1**

		<p>Model.                      -Teachers implement the 5E Instructional Model to promote learning experiences that cause students to think, make connections, formulate and test hypotheses and draw conclusions.                      -Teachers facilitate student-centered learning through the use of the 5E Instructional Model.                      -Common Core Literacy Standards for both Reading and Writing are appropriately embedded throughout the 5E Instruction Model.                      -Each teacher maintains a record of the number of occurrences of engagement tasks (hands-on-learning experiences, labs, and technology) per week. This data is then reported on the Science PLC log.                      -Monthly, school leaders conduct one-on-one data chats with individual teachers using the data gathered from walk-through tools and engagement task records. These</p>				
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

**2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1**

			teacher data/chats guide the leadership's team professional development plan (both individually and whole faculty).				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring				

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

<p><b>2. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring Achievement Levels 4 or 5 in science.</b></p>	<p>2.1 -Not all teachers have received the CCLS for Science overview. -Not all teachers understand how to integrate close reading with the 5E instructional model. -Not all PLCs routinely look at curriculum materials beyond those posted on the curriculum guide</p>	<p>2.1 <b>Strategy</b> Students' comprehension of science text improves when students are engaged in close reading techniques using on-grade-level based text (textbooks and other supplemental texts). Science teachers engage students in the <u>close reading model</u> (appropriately placed within the 5E instructional model) using their textbooks or other appropriate high-Lexile, complex supplemental texts at least <u>1</u> time a week per nine weeks</p>	<p>2.1 <b>Who</b> Principal APEI Science Resource Reading Coach Reading Leadership Team  <b>How Monitored</b> Administration, Coach, Resource walk-throughs -PLC logs turned into administration. -Administration provides feedback.</p>	<p>Science PLC Resource meetings Reading Leadership Team  PLCs will track achievement on the benchmark attached to the Close Reading passage comparing baseline achievement level to 80% mastery using the proximal evaluation tool.</p>	<p><u>3x-per year</u> District level baseline, mid-year, and pre-EOC administration  <u>3x per year</u> District-level end of nine weeks test  <u>During the Grading Period</u> -Core Curriculum Assessments (chapter, end of unit, mini-assessments, etc.)</p>		
---	---	---	--	--	---	--	--

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

	<p>in grade 5.</p> <p><b><u>Action Steps</u></b></p> <p><b><i>Professional Development</i></b></p> <p>-The Reading Coach along with the Science Resource Teacher conduct small group departmental trainings to develop teachers' ability to use the close reading model in a PLC.</p> <p>-The Reading Coach attends science PLCs to co-plan with teachers, developing lessons using the close reading model.</p> <p>-Teachers within grade 5 attend professional development provided by the district/school on text</p>					
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

	<p>complexity and close reading models that are most applicable to science classrooms and support the 5E instructional model.</p> <p><b><i>In PLCs/ Department</i></b></p> <p>-Teachers work in their PLCs to locate, discuss, and disseminate appropriate texts to supplement their textbooks.</p> <p>-PLCs review Close Reading Selections to determine word count and high-Lexile.</p> <p>-PLCs assign appropriate NGSS benchmark to Close Reading passage</p> <p>-To increase stamina, teachers select high-</p>					
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

		<p>Lexile, complex and rigorous texts that are shorter and progress throughout the year to longer texts that are high-Lexile, complex and rigorous</p> <p>- Teachers debrief lesson implementation to determine effectiveness and level of student comprehension and retention of the text. Teachers use this information to build future close reading lessons.</p> <p><b><i>During the lessons, teachers:</i></b></p> <p>-Guide students through text without reading or explaining the meaning of the text</p>				
--	--	---	--	--	--	--



2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

	<p>using the following:          --Introducing critical vocabulary to ensure comprehension of text.          --Stating an essential question prior to reading          --Using questions to check for understanding.          --Using question to engage students in discussion.          --Requiring oral and written responses to text.          -Ask text-based questions that require close reading of the text and multiple reads of the text.</p> <p><b><i>During the lessons, students:</i></b>          -Grapple with complex text.(Pre</p>					
--	---	--	--	--	--	--

**2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1**

		planning Training) -Re-read for a second purpose and to increase comprehensi on. -Engage in discussion to answer essential question using textual evidence. -Write in response to essential question using textual evidence.				
Science Goal #2: The percentage of students scoring a Level 4 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Science will increase from 9% to 19%.	2012 Current Level of Performance	2013Expected Level of Performance:				
	<b>9%</b>	<b>19%</b>				

**Science Professional Development**

<b>Professional Development (PD) aligned with</b>						
---	--	--	--	--	--	--

**2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1**

<b>Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity</b> Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Technology and Hands-On Activities (Nat Geo on-line, scientific probeware, laboratory technology)	Grade K-5	Science Resource	Science teachers	AT Faculty Meeting	Administrators conduct targeted walk-throughs to monitor Technology and Hands-On Activity implementation	Administration Team
Inquiry and the 5E Instructional Model	Grades K-5	Science Resource	Science teachers - PLCs	At Faculty Meeting and PLCs	Administrators conduct targeted walk-throughs to monitor inquiry model.	Administration Team
STEM Fair Workshop	Grades K - 5	<b>Science Resource</b>	Science teachers – whole department	Faculty Meeting – Early Fall	Administrators conduct targeted walk-throughs to monitor long term investigations and participation in STEM Fair	Administration Team
Planning Training	Grades K-5	<b>Science Resource</b>	Science teachers	After school 3 hour training	Administrators monitor through PLC logs that teachers are planning through backwards design.	Administration Team

*End of Science Goals*

**PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS**

**Writing/Language Arts Goals**

<b>Writing/ Language Arts Goals</b>	<b>Problem- Solving Process to Increase Student Achieve- ment</b>						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

<p><b>1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 or higher in writing.</b></p>	<p>-Not all teachers know how to plan and execute writing lessons with a focus on mode-based writing. -Not all teachers know how to review student writing to determine trends and needs in order to drive instruction. -All teachers need training to score student writing accurately during the 2012-2013 school year using information provided by the state.</p>	<p><b>Strategy</b> Students' use of mode-specific writing will improve through use of Writers' Workshop/ daily instruction with a focus on mode-specific writing.</p> <p><b>Action Steps</b> -Based on baseline data, PLCs write SMART goals for each Grading Period. (For example, during the first Grading Period, 50% of the students will score 4.0 or above on the end-of-the Grading Period writing prompt.) (Tier 1-MTSS)</p> <p><b>Plan:</b> -Professional Development for updated rubric courses -Professional</p>	<p><b>Who</b> Principal APEI Writing Resource Teacher  District (Writing Team, Supervisors, Writing Resources, Academic Coaches, and DRTs)</p> <p><b>How Monitored</b> -PLC logs -Classroom walk-throughs -Observation Form -Conferencing while writing walk-through tool (for coaches)</p>	<p>See "Check" &amp; "Act" action steps in the strategies column</p>	<p>-Student monthly demand writes/formative assessments Grades 2 -5 -Student daily drafts -Student revisions -Student portfolios</p>		
--	---	---	---	--	--	--	--

**2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1**

	<p>Development for instructional delivery of mode-specific writing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Training to facilitate data-driven PLCs</li> <li>-Using data to identify trends and drive instruction</li> <li>-Lesson planning based on the needs of students</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Do:</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Daily/ongoing models and application of appropriate mode-specific writing based on teaching points</li> <li>-Daily/ongoing conferencing</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Check:</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Review of daily drafts and scoring monthly</li> <li>demand writes</li> <li>-PLC discussions and analysis of student</li> </ul>					
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

**2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1**

		<p>writing to determine trends and needs</p> <p><u>Act:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Receive additional professional development in areas of need</li> <li>-Seek additional professional knowledge through book studies/ research</li> <li>-Spread the use of effective practices across the school based on evidence shown in the best practice of others</li> <li>-Use what is learned to begin the cycle again, revise as needed, increase scale if possible, etc.</li> <li>-Plan ongoing monitoring of the solution(s)</li> </ul>					
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

**2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1**

Writing/LA Goal #1:	2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:					
The percentage of students scoring <b>Level 3.0</b> or higher on the 2013 FCAT Writes will increase from 80% to 82%.							
	<b>80%</b>	<b>82%</b>					



2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

		<p>1.2. -Improve the teaching of reading skills of Language Arts teachers. -Become more proficient at pacing writer's workshop model.</p>	<p>1.2 <b>Strategy</b> <b>Students' reading, writing, language, and listening / speaking skills improves through engagement in college and career preparatory lessons/ activities/tasks that promote high levels of thinking.</b></p> <p><b>Action Steps</b> <b>Within PLCs</b> <b>Before the unit</b> -Create norms. -Unpack an assessment and rubric. -Set SMART goals for the unit of instruction. -Decide on a way to pre-assess the skills and knowledge of students. (What pre-assessment will we all use?) -Choose the anchor activities teachers will use to assess students' understanding along the way to the assessment. -Reflect on barriers and successes from the year before. -Look at student assessment exemplars (previous students' assessments if available). -Visit the pacing guide and determine the pacing for the unit. -Decide on common terminology to use with students and during PLC discussions. -Look at the grammar</p>	<p>1.2. <b>Who</b> -Principal -APEI -Instruction Coaches -Subject Area Leaders -PLC facilitators of like grades and/or like courses</p> <p><b>How</b> PLCS turn their logs into administration and/or coach after a unit of instruction is complete. -PLCs receive feedback on their logs. -Administrators and coaches attend targeted PLC meetings -Progress of PLCs discussed at Leadership Team -Administration shares the data of PLC visits with staff on a monthly basis. -Administrative walk-throughs looking for implementation of strategy with fidelity and consistency. -Administrator and coach aggregates the walk-through data school-wide and shares with staff the progress of strategy implementation monthly. -Administration shares the positive outcomes observed in PLC meetings on a monthly basis.</p>	<p>1.2. <b>Teacher Level</b> -Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. -Teachers maintain their assessments in the on-line grading system. -Teachers use the on-line grading system data to calculate their students' progress towards the development of their individual/PLC SMART Goal.</p> <p><b>PLC Level</b> -Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the SMART goal data across all classes/courses. -PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction. -For each class/course, PLCs chart their overall progress towards the SMART Goal.</p> <p><b>Leadership Team Level</b> -PLC facilitator/ Subject Area Leader/ Department Heads shares SMART Goal data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. -Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction.</p>	<p>1.2. <b>During the Grading Period</b> Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit)</p>	
--	--	---	---	--	--	--	--

**2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1**

		<p>instruction opportunities provided in the unit and determine their potential usage.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Decide on which vocabulary terms need to be taught during the unit.</li> <li>-Discuss the student's curriculum checklist.</li> <li>-Determine how the PLC would like to grade the assessments in order for there to be consistency among grade levels.</li> </ul> <p><u>During the unit</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Determine:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>--What is working?</li> <li>--Is there a need to enrich the instruction? How?</li> <li>--What isn't working?</li> <li>--Is there a need to supplement the instruction? How?</li> <li>--Are the needs of our ELL/SWD being met?</li> <li>--How can civics be added into instruction?</li> <li>--Is there a need for a demonstration classroom and/or teacher swap?</li> </ul> </li> <li>-Conduct a pacing check.</li> <li>-Bring anchor activities (artifacts) to assess student understanding.</li> <li>-Discuss effective student placement (If plausible discuss how classroom environment might help a student that is struggling in a class. Could a change of class period or teacher help?)</li> <li>-Plan strategies to differentiate.</li> <li>-Plan higher order thinking questions.</li> </ul>				
--	--	---	--	--	--	--

**2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1**

		<p>-Discuss portfolio implementation (Success/Barriers).          -Discuss baseline date/data from anchor activities/data from EAs.          -Determine whether teachers want to add additional criteria to the EA rubric.          -Discuss additions to the writer's checklists.</p> <p><u>During the assessment</u>          -Agree upon a date when all assessments need to be completed.          -Discuss successes and challenges.</p> <p><u>After the assessment</u>          Participate in an assessment Norming session (Data to be discussed after EAs are all scored).</p> <p><u>After all assessments have been scored</u>          -Reflect on the unit.          -Reflect on the effectiveness of the PLC (survey).          -Revisit portfolios.          -Identify the skills students struggled with and determine which activities in further lessons will readdress the skills needing to be re-taught or strengthened.          -Recognize successes and celebrate.</p> <p><i><b>In the classroom</b></i>  <u>During the lessons, teachers:</u>          -Post essential questions and daily objectives.</p>				
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

**2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1**

		<p>-Explicitly reference connections between the following: essential questions, daily objective, and assessment.          -Select learning strategies as needed.          -Group students appropriately.          -Scaffold instruction building towards higher complexity.          -Model and provide opportunities for guided and independent practice of skills aligned with the assessment.          -Select academic vocabulary from text to be used during a unit of instruction.          -Use multiple types of formative assessment and provide consistent checks for student understanding.          -Use data during the lesson and after the assessment to inform instruction.</p> <p><u>During the lessons, students:</u></p> <p>-Understand the criteria which will be used to evaluate their work.          -Understand the purpose of the lesson and its connection to the assessment.          -Think critically and creatively.          -Actively draw upon prior knowledge and use that knowledge to connect with lesson goals.          -Know when, why, and how to use strategies when appropriate free of teacher support.          -Collaborate within</p>				
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

**2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1**

		<p>structured grouping.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>-Self assess understanding of content.</li><li>-Use academic vocabulary in written and oral responses.</li></ul> <p><u>After the lessons. teachers:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>-Post exemplars of student work.</li><li>-Self reflect on lessons.</li></ul>				
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

**2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1**

		<p>1.3. -PLCs struggle with how to structure curriculum and data analysis discussion to deepen their leaning. To address this barrier, this year PLCs are being trained to use the Plan-Do-Check-Act “Instructional Unit” log.</p>	<p>1.3. <b>Strategy</b> Student achievement improves through teachers working collaboratively to focus on student learning. Specifically, they use the Plan-Do-Check-Act model and log to structure their way of work. Using the backwards design model for units of instruction, teachers focus on the following four questions:  <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. What is it we expect them to learn?</li> <li>2. How will we know if they have learned it?</li> <li>3. How will we respond if they don’t learn?</li> <li>4. How will we respond if they already know it?</li> </ol> <b>Actions/Details</b>                      -Grade level/like-course PLCs use a <b>Plan-Do-Check-Act “Unit of Instruction” log</b> to guide their discussion and way of work. Discussions are summarized on log.                      -Additional action steps for this strategy are outlined on grade level/content area PLC action plans.</p>	<p>1.3. <b>Who</b>                      -Principal                      -AP                      -Instruction Coaches                      -Subject Area Leaders                      -PLC facilitators of like grades and/or like courses   <b>How</b>                      PLCs turn their logs into administration and/or coach after a unit of instruction is complete.                      -PLCs receive feedback on their logs.                      -Administrators and coaches attend targeted PLC meetings                      -Progress of PLCs discussed at Leadership Team                      -Administration shares the data of PLC visits with staff on a monthly basis.</p>	<p>1.3 School has a system for PLCs to record and report during-the-grading period SMART goal outcomes to administration, coach, SAL, and/or leadership team.</p>	<p>1.3. <b>During the Grading Period</b>                      Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit)</p>	
--	--	--	---	--	---	---	--

**Writing/Language Arts Professional Development**

<b>Professional</b>						
---------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--

**2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1**

<b>Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity</b> Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Writing Holistic Scoring Training	2-5	Academic Coach Writing Resource Teacher	Language Arts Teachers PLC-grade level and vertical teams	On-going	PLC logs turned into administration	Principal APEI Writing Resource
MOODLE Writing Training	K-5	Academic Coach Writing Resource Teacher	Language Arts Teachers PLC-grade level and vertical teams	On-going	-Administration or Coach walk-throughs -PLC logs turned into administration	Principal APEI Writing Resource
Coaching	K-5	Academic Coach Writing Resource Teacher	Language Arts Teachers PLC-grade level and vertical teams	On-going	-Administration or Coach walk-throughs -PLC logs turned into administration	Principal APEI Writing Resource

*End of Writing/Language Arts Goals*

**PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS**

**Attendance Goal(s)**

Attendance Goal(s)	Problem-solving Process to Increase Attendance						
Based on the analysis of attendance data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		



**2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1**

<p><b>1. Attendance</b></p>	<p>1.1 -Attendance committee needs to meet on a regular basis throughout the school year. -Need support in building and maintain the student database.</p>	<p>1.1 <b>Tier 1</b> The school will establish an attendance committee comprised of Administrators, guidance counselors, teachers and other relevant personnel to review the school's attendance plan and discuss school wide interventions to address needs relevant to current attendance data. The attendance committee will also maintain a database of students with significant attendance problems and implement and monitor interventions to be documented on the attendance intervention form (SB 90710) The attendance committee meets every two weeks.</p>	<p>1.1 Attendance committee will keep a log and notes that will be reviewed by the social worker on a monthly basis and shared with faculty.</p>	<p>1.1 Attendance committee will monitor the attendance data from the targeted group of students.</p>	<p>1.1 Instructional Planning Tool Attendance/ Tardy data Ed Connect</p>		
-----------------------------	--	---	--	---	--	--	--

**2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1**

<p><u>Attendance Goal #1:</u></p> <p>1. The attendance rate will increase from 93% in 2011-2012 to 96% in 2012-2013.</p> <p>2. The attendance rate will increase from 93% in 2011-2012 to 96% in 2012-2013. The number of students who have 10 or more <b>unexcused</b> absences throughout the school year will decrease by 10%</p> <p>3. The number of students who have 10 or more <b>unexcused</b> tardies to school throughout the school year will decrease by 10%.</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Attendance Rate:*</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Attendance Rate:*</u></p>					
	<p><b>93.18%</b></p>	<p><b>96%</b></p>					
	<p><u>2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)</u></p>					
	<p><b>117</b></p>	<p><b>105</b></p>					
	<p><u>2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)</u></p>					
	<p><b>46</b></p>	<p><b>41</b></p>					

**2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1**

		1.2 -Need teachers to follow protocol to contact families when three absences are reached.	1.2 <b>Tier 1</b> All teachers will post their attendance to EASI	1.2 Assistant Principal/Team leaders/ Grade Level Leads/ Teachers/Social Worker will monitor EASI	1.2 Principal will use EASI reports to evaluate teachers adherence to policy	1.2 EASI	
		1.3 There is no system to reinforce parents for facilitating improvement in attendance.	1.3 <b>Tier 2</b> Beginning at the 5th unexcused absence, the Attendance Committee (which is a subgroup of the Leadership Team) collaborate to ensure that a letter is sent home to parents outlining the state statute that requires parents send students to school. If a student's attendance improves (no absences in a 20 day period) a positive letter is sent home to the parent regarding the increase in their child's attendance. Popcorn incentives will be given to the class with the most 100% attendance days each week as well as snow cone celebrations for Perfect Attendance all quarter.	1.3 Social Worker Guidance Counselor PSLT	1.3 The attendance committee (which is a subset of the leadership Team) will disaggregate attendance data for the "Tier 2" group along with the guidance counselor and maintain communication about these children.	Instructional Planning Tool Attendance/Tardy data	

<b>Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning</b>							
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

**2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1**

<b>Community (PLC) or PD Activity</b> Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
EASI	K - 5	AP	School-wide	September and then as needed basis	Random check of EdLine postings	APEI

*End of Attendance Goals*

Suspension Goal(s)

<b>Suspension Goal(s)</b>	<b>Problem-solving Process to Decrease Suspension</b>						
Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

**2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1**

<p><b>1. Suspension</b></p>	<p>1.1 There needs to be common school-wide expectations and rules for appropriate classroom behavior.</p>	<p>1.1 <u>Tier 1</u> -Positive Behavior Support (PBS) and CHAMPS will be implemented to address school-wide expectations and rules, set these through staff survey, discipline data, and provide training to staff in methods for teaching and reinforcing the school-wide rules and expectations.  -Providing teachers with resources for continued teaching and reinforcement of school expectations and rules.  -Leadership team conducts walkthroughs using a PBS and CHAMPS walk-through form (generated by</p>	<p>1.1 <u>Who</u> -PSLT Behavior Committee -Leadership Team -Administration</p>	<p>1.1 - PSLT /Behavior Committee will review data on Office Discipline Referrals ODRs and out of school suspensions, ATOSS data monthly.</p>	<p>UNTIE , EASI ODR and suspension data cross-referenced with mainframe discipline data</p>		
-----------------------------	--	--	---	---	---	--	--

**2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1**

		<p>the district RtI facilitators).</p> <p>-The data is shared with faculty at a monthly meeting, tracking the overall improvement of the faculty.</p> <p>-Where needed, administration conducts individual teacher walk-through data chats.</p>					
<p><u>Suspension Goal #1:</u>                      1. The total number of In-School Suspensions will decrease by 10%.                      2. The total number of students receiving In-School Suspension throughout the school year will decrease by 10%.                      3. The total number of Out-of-School Suspensions will decrease by 10%.                      4. The total number of students receiving Out-of-School Suspensions throughout the school year will decrease by 10%.</p>	<p><u>2012 Total</u>  <u>Number of</u>  <u>In-School</u>  <u>Suspensions</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected</u>  <u>Number of</u>  <u>In-School</u>  <u>Suspensions</u></p>					
	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>					

**2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1**

	<u>2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School</u>	<u>2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School</u>					
	<b>4</b>	<b>2</b>					
	<u>2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions</u>	<u>2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions</u>					
	<b>64</b>	<b>57</b>					
	<u>2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School</u>	<u>2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School</u>					
	<b>42</b>	<b>37</b>					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

**Suspension Professional Development**

<b>Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity</b> Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
	PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring

**2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1**

Positive Behavior Support (PBS)	PK-5	District And PSB Team	School-wide	Monthly updates at faculty meetings	Administration, RtI facilitator, and guidance /psychologist walk-throughs	Administration, RtI facilitator, and guidance /psychologist walk-throughs
CHAMPS	PK-5	District And PSB Team	School-wide	Monthly updates at faculty meetings	Administration, RtI facilitator, and guidance /psychologist walk-throughs	Administration, RtI facilitator, and guidance /psychologist walk-throughs

*End of Suspension Goals*

**Health and Fitness Goal(s)**

<b>ADDITIONAL GOAL(S)</b>	<b>Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</b>						
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	<b>Anticipated Barrier</b>	<b>Strategy</b>	<b>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</b>	<b>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</b>	<b>Evaluation Tool</b>		
<b>1. Additional Goal</b> <u>Additional Goal #1:</u>	1. The mobility rate of students and families.	1. Elementary School students will engage in the equivalent of one class period per day of physical education in grades K through 5.	1.APEI PE coaches Classroom Teachers	1.Checking student schedules	1.		



**2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1**

<p>During the 2012-2013 school year, the number of students scoring in the “Healthy Fitness Zone” (HFZ) on the Pacer for assessing aerobic capacity and cardiovascular health will increase from <u>40.8</u> % on the Pretest to <u>47</u> % on the Posttest.</p> <p><i>Schools will enter the data after the Pretest and Posttest. Make sure there is at least a 10% between the Pretest and Posttest.</i></p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level:</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level:</u></p>					
	<p>40.8%</p>	<p>47%</p>					
			<p>2. Health and physical activity initiatives developed and implemented by the Principal’s designee.</p>	<p>2 Physical Education Teachers</p>	<p>2. Data on the number of students scoring in the Healthy Fitness Zone (HFZ)</p>	<p>2. PACER test component of the FITNESSGRAM PACER for assessing cardiovascular health.</p>	
			<p>3. Five physical education classes per week for a minimum of one semester per year with a certified physical education teacher.</p>	<p>3. Physical Education Teachers</p>	<p>3. Classroom walk-throughs Class schedules</p>	<p>3. PACER test component of the FITNESSGRAM PACER for assessing cardiovascular health.</p>	

<p><b>Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity</b> Please note that each</p>						
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

**2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1**

Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
PDS for P.E. Coaches	Physical Education	P.E. Department	Subject – P.E. Teachers	Professional Study Days	Attendance at PDS	Administration

**Continuous Improvement Goal(s)**

<b>ADDITIONAL GOAL(S)</b>	<b>Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</b>						
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	<b>Anticipated Barrier</b>	<b>Strategy</b>	<b>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</b>	<b>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</b>	<b>Evaluation Tool</b>		

**2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1**

<p><b>1. Additional Goal</b> <u>Additional Goal #1:</u></p>	<p>1.1 -There is still confusion on how to conduct PLCs that are focused on deepening the knowledge base of teachers and improving student performance by the implementation of the Plan-Do-Check-Act model. -Still confusion on how the Plan-Do-Check-Act model works. -Still some resistance to staff members attending PLCs and/or arriving on time to meetings. -Teachers asking for more PLC collaboration time. Possibility of waiver will be explored.</p>	<p>1.1 The leadership team will become trained on the use of the PLC “Unit of Instruction” log that follows the Plan-Do-Check-Act model. Subject Area Leader and/or PLC facilitators will guide their PLCs through the Plan-Do-Check-Act model for units of instruction. The work will be recorded on PLC logs that are reviewed by the Leadership Team.</p>	<p>1.1 <u>Who</u> Principal Leadership Team Subject Area Leaders PLC facilitators</p>	<p>1.1 “Quick” PLC informal surveys will be administered during the school year every two months. The Leadership Team will aggregate the data and share outcomes of the school-wide results with their PLCs. The data will provide direction for future PLC training.</p>	<p>1.1 PLC Survey materials from Teams to Teach (Anne Jolly)</p>		
---	---	--	---	---	--	--	--

**2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1**

<p>The percentage of teachers who strongly agree with the indicator that “teachers meet on a regular basis to discuss their students’ learning, share best practices, problem solve and develop lessons/ assessments that improve student performance (under Teaching and Learning)” will increase from 63.6% in 2012 to 75% in 2013.</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level:</u></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level:</u></p>					
	<p>63.6%</p>	<p>75%</p>					
		<p>1.2 -Not enough time to meet in PLCs.</p>	<p>1.2 Leadership team will use teacher survey information every nine weeks to determine next steps for PLC professional development.</p>	<p>1.2 <u>Who</u> Leadership team  <u>How</u> Leadership team aggregates the data</p>	<p>1.2 “Quick” PLC informal surveys will be administered during the school year every two months. The Leadership Team will aggregate the data and share outcomes of the school-wide results with their PLCs. The data will provide direction for future PLC training.</p>	<p>1.2 PLC Survey materials from Teams to Teach (Anne Jolly)</p>	

**Continuous Improvement Goals Professional Development**

<p><b>Professional Development</b></p>						
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

**2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1**

<b>(PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity</b> Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
PLCs	All teachers	Team Leaders	Grade/Subject area	Weekly	PLC Logs Administrator and leadership team walk-throughs	Team Leaders Administration
Plan-Do-Check-Act Model	Leadership Team All teachers	Leadership Team Subject Area Leaders PLC Facilitators	School-wide	PLCs meet every three weeks for Plan-Do-Check-Act PLCs.	Administrator and leadership team walk-throughs Administrator and leadership attendance at PLC meetings PLC Survey data	Leadership Team

*End of Additional Goal(s)*

**Goal(s) For the 2012-2013 School Year**

**Reading Florida Alternate Assessment Goals**

**Editor Note: Data for this goal can be found on The Office of Assessment’s SIP Evaluation and Development Report**

<p><b>A. Florida Alternate Assessment:</b> Students scoring proficient/satisfactory performance in reading (Levels 4-9).</p>	A.1.	A.1. <b>See Reading Goal 5d</b>	A.1.	A.1.	A.1.		
<p><b>Reading Goal A:</b> The percentage of students scoring a Level 4 or higher on the 2013 FAA will maintain or increase by 1%.  Only 4 students; therefore, too small of number to statically calculate.</p>	<p>2012 Current Level of Performance:</p>	<p>2013 Expected Level of Performance:</p>					
	<b>NA</b>	<b>NA</b>					
		A.2.	A.2.	A.2.	A.2.	A.2.	

**2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1**

		A.3.	A.3.	A.3.	A.3.	A.3.	
<b>B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in reading.</b>	B.1.	B.1. <b>See Reading Goal 5d</b>	B.1.	B.1.	B.1.		
<u>Reading Goal B:</u> The percentage of students making learning gains on the 2013 FAA will maintain or increase by 1%.  Only 4 students; therefore, too small of number to statically calculate	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:</u>					
	<b>NA</b>	<b>NA</b>					
		B.2.	B.2.	B.2.	B.2.	B.2.	
		B.3.	B.3.	B.3.	B.3.	B.3.	

**Goal(s) For the 2012-2013 School Year**

**Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals**

**Editor Note: Data for this goal can be found on The Office of Assessment’s SIP Evaluation and Development Report**

CELLA Goals	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Language Acquisition					
Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
C. Students scoring proficient/satisfactory performance in Listening/ Speaking.	1.1.	1.1. <b>See Reading ELL Goal 5C.1, 5C.2, 5C.3 and 5C.4</b>	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	



**2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1**

<p><b>CELLA Goal #C:</b> The percentage of students scoring proficient on the 2013 Listening/Speaking section of the CELLA will increase from <u>39</u> % to <u>45</u> %.</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Listening/Speaking:</u></p>					
	<p><b>39%</b></p>					
	<p><b>45%</b></p>	<p>1.2.</p>	<p>1.2.</p>	<p>1.2.</p>	<p>1.2.</p>	<p>1.2.</p>
		<p>1.3.</p>	<p>1.3.</p>	<p>1.3.</p>	<p>1.3.</p>	<p>1.3.</p>
<p>Students read in English at grade level text in a manner similar to non-ELL students.</p>	<p>Anticipated Barrier</p>	<p>Strategy</p>	<p>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</p>	<p>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</p>	<p>Evaluation Tool</p>	

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

<p><b>D. Students scoring proficient/satisfactory performance in Reading.</b></p>	<p>2.1.</p>	<p>2.1. <b>See Reading ELL Goal 5C.1, 5C.2, 5C.3 and 5C.4</b></p>	<p>2.1.</p>	<p>2.1.</p>	<p>2.1.</p>	
<p><b>CELLA Goal #D:</b> The percentage of students scoring proficient on the 2013 Reading section of the CELLA will increase from <u>20</u>% to <u>28</u>%.</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Reading :</u></p>					
	<p><b>20%</b></p>					
		<p>2.2.</p>	<p>2.2.</p>	<p>2.2.</p>	<p>2.2.</p>	<p>2.2.</p>
		<p>2.3</p>	<p>2.3</p>	<p>2.3</p>	<p>2.3</p>	<p>2.3</p>
<p>Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.</p>	<p>Anticipated Barrier</p>	<p>Strategy</p>	<p>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</p>	<p>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</p>	<p>Evaluation Tool</p>	

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

<p>E. Students scoring proficient/satisfactory performance in Writing.</p>	<p>2.1.</p>	<p>2.1. <b>See Reading ELL Goal 5C.1, 5C.2, 5C.3 and 5C.4</b></p>	<p>2.1.</p>	<p>2.1.</p>	<p>2.1.</p>	
<p><u>CELLA Goal #E:</u> The percentage of students scoring proficient on the 2013 Writing section of the CELLA will increase from <u>22</u>% to <u>30</u>%.</p>	<p><u>2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Writing:</u></p>					
	<p><b>22%</b></p>					
		<p>2.2.</p>	<p>2.2.</p>	<p>2.2.</p>	<p>2.2.</p>	<p>2.2.</p>
		<p>2.3</p>	<p>2.3</p>	<p>2.3</p>	<p>2.3</p>	<p>2.3</p>

Goal(s) For the 2012-2013 School Year

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

**Math Florida Alternate Assessment Goals**

**Editor Note: Data for this goal can be found on The Office of Assessment’s SIP Evaluation and Development Report**

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
<b>F. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at in mathematics (Levels 4-9).</b>	F.1.	F.1. <b>See Math Goal 5d</b>	F.1.	F.1.	F.1.		
<b>Mathematics Goal E:</b> The percentage of students scoring a Level 4 or higher on the 2013 FAA will maintain or increase by 1%.  Only 4 students; therefore, too small of number to statically calculate	2012 Current <u>Level of Performance</u>	2013 Expected <u>Level of Performance</u>					

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

	NA	NA					
		F.2.	F.2.	F.2.	F.2.	F.2.	
		F.3.	F.3.	F.3.	F.3.	F.3.	
<b>G. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics.</b>	G.1.	G.1. <b>See Math Goal 5d</b>	G.1.	G.1.	G.1.		
<b>Mathematics Goal G:</b> The percentage of students making learning gains on the 2013 FAA will maintain or increase by 1%.  Only 4 students; therefore, too small of number to statically calculate	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance</u>					

**2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1**

	<b>NA</b>	<b>NA</b>					
		G.2.	G.2.	G.2.	G.2.	G.2.	
		G.3.	G.3.	G.3.	G.3.	G.3.	

**Goal(s) For the 2012-2013 School Year**

**Science Florida Alternate Assessment Goal**

**Editor Note: Data for this goal can be found on The Office of Assessment’s SIP Evaluation and Development Report**

<b>Elementary and Middle Science Goals</b>	<b>Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</b>						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

**2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1**

<p><b>J. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at proficient in science (Levels 4-9).</b></p>	<p>J.1. -Need to provide a school organization structure and procedure for regular and on-going review of students' IEPs To address this barrier, the APC will put a system in place for this school year.</p>	<p>J.1. <u>Strategy</u> SWD student achievement improves through the effective and consistent implementation of students' IEP goals, strategies, modifications, and accommodations. -Throughout the school year, teachers of SWD review students' IEPs to ensure that IEPs are implemented consistently and with fidelity. -Teachers (both individually and in PLCs) work to improve upon both individually and collectively, the ability to effectively</p>	<p>J.1. <u>Who</u> Principal, Site Administrator, Assistance Principal <u>How</u> IEP Progress Reports reviewed by APC</p>	<p>J.1. <u>Teacher Level</u> -Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. -Teachers use the on-line grading system data to calculate their students' progress towards their PLC and/or individual SMART Goal. <u>PLC Level</u> -Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the SMART goal data across all classes/courses. -PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction. - For each class/course, PLCs chart their overall progress towards the SMART Goal. <u>Leadership Team Level</u> -PLC facilitator/ Subject Area Leader/ Department Heads shares SMART Goal data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. -Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction.</p>	<p>-Core curriculum Chapter Assessments  -Student Science Notebooks  - Daily student performance</p>		
--	--	--	--	---	--	--	--

**2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1**

		implement IEP/SWD strategies and modifications into lessons.					
<u>Science Goal J:</u> The percentage of students scoring a Level 4 or higher on the 2013 FAA will maintain or increase by 1%.  Zero students; therefore, too small of number to statically calculate	2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:					
	NA	NA					
		J.2.	J.2.	J.2.	J.2.	J.2.	
		J.3.	J.3.	J.3.	J.3.	J.3.	

**Goal(s) For the 2012-2013 School Year**

**NEW Writing Florida Alternate Assessment Goal**

**Editor Note: Data for this goal can be found on The Office of Assessment’s SIP Evaluation and Development Report**



**2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1**

<b>Writing Goals</b>	<b>Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</b>						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

<p><b>M. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing (Levels 4-9).</b></p>	<p>M.1. -Need to provide a school organization structure and procedure for regular and on-going review of students' IEPs To address this barrier, the APC will put a system in place for this school year.</p>	<p>M.1. <b>Strategy</b> SWD student achievement improves through the effective and consistent implementation of students' IEP goals, strategies, modifications, and accommodations. -Throughout the school year, teachers of SWD review students' IEPs to ensure that IEPs are implemented consistently and with fidelity. -Teachers (both individually and in PLCs) work to improve upon both individually and collectively, the ability to effectively</p>	<p>M.1. <b>Who</b> Principal, Site Administrator, Assistant Principal <b>How</b> IEP Progress Reports reviewed by APC</p>	<p>M.1. <b>Teacher Level</b> -Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. -Teachers use the on-line grading system data to calculate their students' progress towards their PLC and/or individual SMART Goal. <b>PLC Level</b> -Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the SMART goal data across all classes/courses. -PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction. -For each class/course, PLCs chart their overall progress towards the SMART Goal. <b>Leadership Team Level</b> -PLC facilitator/ Subject Area Leader/ Department Heads shares SMART Goal data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. -Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction.</p>	<p>On-going writing prompts and assessments</p>	
---	--	--	---	--	---	--

**2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1**

		implement IEP/SWD strategies and modifications into lessons.					
<u>Writing Goal M:</u> The percentage of students scoring a Level 4 or higher on the 2013 FAA will maintain or increase by 1%.  Only 2 students; therefore, too small of number to statically calculate	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:</u>					
	NA	NA					

**Goal(s) For the 2012-2013 School Year**

**Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) Goal(s)**

<b>STEM Goal(s)</b>	<b>Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</b>				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool

## 2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

STEM Goal #1: Implement/expand project/problem-based learning in math, science and CTE/STEM electives.	1.1 Need common planning time for math, science, ELA and other STEM teachers	1.1 -Explicit direction for STEM professional learning communities to be established. -Documentation of planning of units and outcomes of units in logs. -Increase effectiveness of lessons through lesson study and district metrics, etc.	1.1 PLC or grade level lead -Subject Area Leaders	1.1 Administrative/SAL walk-throughs	1.1 Logging number of project-based learning in math, science and CTE/STEM elective per nine week. Share data with teachers.
	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

### STEM Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Project-based learning	K-5	Resource Teachers, PSLT	Science, math, ELA and technology teachers PLCs	On-going	Administrator walk-throughs	Administration

*End of STEM Goal(s)*

### Goal(s) For the 2012-2013 School Year

### Career and Technical Education (CTE) Goal(s)

Hillsborough 2012  
Rule 6A-1.099811  
Revised July 18, 2012

**2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1**

<b>CTE Goal(s)</b>	<b>Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</b>				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<p><b>CTE Goal #1:</b> Sustain/Increase the number of Career Technical Student Organization chapters from <u>3</u> in 2011-2012 to <u>5</u> in 2012-2013.</p> <p>Increase the student membership from <u>350</u> in 2011-2012 to <u>Entire Student Body (350)</u> in 2012-2013.</p>	<p>1. Time-we have an academically packed day, and funding.</p>	<p>1.1. Increase student participation in CTSO competitions/events</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Provide field trips to the Glazer Museum During the day and for Family night</li> <li>● Implement special speakers to visit and share with students about CTE careers throughout the year and during the Great American Teach-In</li> </ul>	<p>1.1. Parent Liaison Guidance Counselor</p>	<p>1.1. Aggregate and analyze the data every quarter to develop next steps</p>	<p>1.1. Log of number of CTSO events Log of number of students who attend CTSO events</p>
	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

**CTE Professional Development**

<b>Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC)</b>						
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

## 2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

<b>or PD Activity</b> Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Establishing or growing a CTSO.	K-5	District	Parent Liaison Guidance Counselor	October, 2012	Log of events and attendance	Parent Liaison Guidance Counselor

*End of CTE Goal(s)*

## Differentiated Accountability

### School-level Differentiated Accountability (DA) Compliance

Please choose the school's DA Status. (To activate the checkbox: 1. double click the desired box; 2.when the menu pops up, select "checked" under "Default Value" header; 3. Select "OK", this will place an "x" in the box.)

<b>School Differentiated Accountability Status</b>		
Priority	Focus	Prevent

- *Once the state has provided information, directions for how to upload the checklist will be posted on the School Improvement Icon.*

## School Advisory Council (SAC)

### SAC Membership Compliance

The majority of the SAC members are not employed by the school district. The SAC is composed of the principal and an appropriately balanced number of teachers, education support employees, students (for middle and high school only), parents, and other business and community members who are representative of the ethnic, racial, and economic community served by the school. Please verify the statement above by selecting "Yes" or "No" below.

Yes

No

If No, describe the measures being taken to comply with SAC requirements.

**2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1**

--

Describe the use of SAC funds.( About 380 students, \$3 each for an estimated sum of \$1140.00)			
Name and Number of Strategy from the School Improvement Plan	Description of Resources that improves student achievement or student engagement	Projected Amount	Final Amount
Attendance Goal 1.1	<u>Incentives Approved by SAC:</u> The attendance committee will use funding to support weekly incentives to homerooms in each grade level with the most 100% attendance weekly. The monies will also support the snow cones for the quarterly celebrations of Perfect Attendance. Postcards and Postage as incentives.	\$640.00	
Reading Goal 4.1	<u>Approved by SAC:</u>		
Mathematics Goal 3.1	<u>Approved by SAC:</u>		
Science Goal 1.1	<u>Approved by SAC:</u>		
Reading Goal 3.3	<u>Approved by SAC:</u>		
Suspension Goal 1.1	<u>Approved by SAC:</u> PBS Incentives	\$250.00	
Parent Involvement Goal 1.1	Supplies (including food) to support Family Night Events (Family Night for Math, Science, Reading, and Writing Family Nights) Clarifying details: Walmart, Sam's and Publix.	\$250.00 (\$50.00 each)	
Final Amount Spent	\$1140.00 -TBA		